THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVIII.—APRIL, 1893.—No. 70.

THE AGE OF THE HUMAN RACE ACCORDING TO MODERN SCIENCE AND BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY.

PART I.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN ACCORDING TO ASTRONOMY AND HISTORY.

"THE pivotal centre," says the learned Father Hewit, "around which a whole system of topics turns, is the topic of the antiquity of the human race."[1] With the exception of evolution, which has a literature of its own and counts its volumes by thousands and tens of thousands, no other scientific subject, it may be safely asserted, has provoked so much discussion, as has the antiquity of our race. For a full hundred years the question of the age of the human species has engaged the attention of scientists and Biblical scholars, and yet, notwithstanding all that has been done in the various departments of knowledge, we are still very far from having definite information on many of the points in dispute.

Many causes might be assigned for the interest that has been manifested in the question,—an interest, which, far from subsiding, seems to enhance as time rolls on; but not the least potent has been, no doubt, the antagonism that by many was imagined to exist between the teachings of Scriptural chronology and the findings of modern science. For this reason, therefore, the question of the age of the human race is one that must interest the Biblical as well as the scientific student, and, in consequence, our modern Scriptural exegetists have given to the subject almost as

[1] "Scriptural Questions," the *Catholic World*, p. 645, 1885.

much thought and study as have the most zealous votaries of science. The topic is certainly a fascinating one, and we are in no wise surprised that so many investigators have spent so much time in attempts at its elucidation.

Like all scientific subjects that are tinged with a human and a religious interest, it has a charm that no subject of pure science can ever possess. And until all difficulties bearing on the question are cleared up; until all doubts arising from the supposed conflict of science with Scriptural chronology are dissipated, and until it shall be demonstrated that there is and can be no difference of teaching by science on the one hand, and Scripture on the other, regarding the time man has existed on earth, so long will the question of the antiquity of our race continue to have, for many investigators at least, the paramount attraction that is now so notable.

Fully to appreciate the reason of the great interest which attaches to the study of questions like the one under discussion, and to understand the cause of the wide divergence of views of a certain class of scientists on the one hand, and of orthodox Scriptural interpreters on the other, regarding many passages in the Bible, especially in the Pentateuch, it is necessary to take cognizance of the influences which have contributed to the development of that pronounced form of Rationalism which is such a striking and dominant characteristic of our age.

In every age of the Church, Rationalism has been more or less prevalent. In the first centuries of her existence it was championed by Celsus, Porphyry, Hierocles and Julian the Apostate. In mediæval times Averroës and his followers were its chief coryphei. At the present time—and during the past hundred years, for that matter—the great stronghold of Rationalism is in Germany. But it would be scarcely true to say that the Rationalism, now so rampant, is an indigenous growth among the Germans. Luther did, indeed, sow the germs of free thought when he proclaimed his principle of private interpretation of the Bible; but neither he nor his countrymen seemed to realize the consequences to which this principle would logically and inevitably lead. It is more consonant with the facts of history to regard German Rationalism as an exotic, greatly developed and transformed, it is true, by reason of congenial soil and favorable environment, but nevertheless an exotic, transplanted from lands where the genius and temperament of the people, although in some respects similar to, are yet in others entirely different from, those of the Teutonic race.

The first to perceive the full significance of the principles laid down by the heresiarchs of the sixteenth century and the first to

draw conclusions in accordance with the premises involved were the Deists of England. Lord Herbert, of Cherbury, is usually regarded as the father of English Deism. In his work on truth and revelation[1] published in 1624, he rejects revelation as useless and reduces Deism to a system. He soon had a large number of followers, and among them some of the keenest intellects and most famous wits of the time.

The noted materialist, Hobbes, although differing from Herbert in philosophy, shared many of his views on religion and morals. Among later Deists who contributed much towards sowing the seeds of doubt and free thought, and sapping the foundations of religion in Great Britain were Shaftesbury, Blout, Toland, Collins, Tindal, Morgan, Woolston, Chubb, Whiston, Somers, Shrewsbury, Buckingham and Bolingbroke.

Toland regarded Christianity as a superstition, and had no respect either for revealed truth or the principles of natural morality. Tindal followed in the wake of Lord Herbert, and with Morgan united in considering the religion of Christ but a forerunner of natural religion. To Woolston the miracles of the Gospel were mere allegories. He, accordingly, with Chubb, Whiston, Shaftesbury, and, above all, with Hume, made his onslaughts on these evidences of revealed truth. Collins and Craig directed their shafts against the prophecies of the Old Testament. All combined to assail the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, and the consequence was that many whose faith was wavering, soon found themselves deprived of the little they still possessed.

Natural religion and Rationalism were the first fruits of these persistent attacks on the Bible. But the work of religious disintegration was not to be confined to England. It was soon to affect France, and then Germany and other parts of Europe. During his enforced sojourn in England, Voltaire had found congenial associates among the leading Deists and free-thinkers of the day, and was not slow to imbibe their principles. As may easily be imagined, he was an apt pupil.

Of all the English Deists, Bolingbroke seems to have exerted the greatest influence on the "Sage of Ferney," and to have supplied him with much of the material with which he afterwards so violently assailed both the Old and the New Testament. But it was not argument that Voltaire employed in his assaults on Christianity, which at one time he egotistically fancied he could destroy, but refined derision and irony. A peerless master of epigram and endowed with a keen, penetrating understanding, he made the Bible and the Church the butt of his brilliant, flashing

[1] *De Veritate prout Distinguitur a Revelatione, a Verisimili, a Falso.*

wit and of his caustic and withering ridicule. Understanding thoroughly, as he did, the temperament of his countrymen, Voltaire was fully aware of the power of the weapons he employed. Nothing, he knew, would affect a Frenchman sooner than sarcasm or a well turned epigram, and accordingly, during his long and eventful warfare against Christianity, he never deviated from the plan of campaign which he first adopted. To say that he was not in a measure successful in his nefarious purposes would be to controvert history. The evil that he accomplished can never be estimated.

As Herbert was the father of Deism in England, so was Voltaire the father of Infidelity in France. But he was not alone in his attack on the Church and all that the French people, until his time, had revered as sacred. He was aided and abetted by a number of kindred spirits, like Diderot, Rousseau, Helvetius, Condillac and others, who by their writings generally, but above all by that monument of falsehood and impiety, the French *Encyclopédie*, made Infidelity fashionable and paved the way for the Reign of Terror.

From France the tidal-wave of free thought soon passed on to Germany, where it issued in forms of Rationalism and Materialism, Atheism and Nihilism, before which the world stood appalled.

The work of destruction was inaugurated by Samuel Reimarus, a professor of philosophy in Hamburg. He died in 1768, leaving a collection of manuscripts from which Lessing subsequently published numerous extracts under the title of *Wolfenbüttelsche Fragmente eines Ungenannten*.[1] Reimarus's production was a direct attack on the historical basis of Christianity, and opened the floodgates for the deluge of Rationalism which has since extended its ravages from the mouth of the Elbe to the Mediterranean, and from the Ural Mountains to the Irish Sea.

Prior to the time of Reimarus there had been exhibited in certain quarters a disposition to question the inspiration of the Scriptures; but the public was not yet prepared for the revolutionary teachings of Reimarus and Lessing. The illustrious Dutch jurist, Hugo Grotius, and the pantheistic Jew, Spinoza, had called in doubt some of the fundamental principles of theologians respecting Biblical interpretation and criticism; but their doctrines lay practically dormant until the eighteenth century, when their influence began to be felt throughout the length and breadth of Europe,—an influence which has continued unabated in power and extent until the present day.

---

[1] Vigouroux, *La Bible et Les Deconvertes Modernes*, Article, "Fragments de Wolfenbüttel."

Luther repudiated tradition; Lessing, who has been called the Luther of the eighteenth century, repudiated the Bible, as a divinely inspired work. Thenceforward, Scriptural commentators seemed to vie with one another as to who could carry farthest the work of disintegration and demolition. Every book, every chapter, every verse, every word of the Old and New Testaments was submitted to the microscope of the "higher criticism." Every statement of Scripture was compared with the teachings of profane science, and declared true or false, according as it agreed or disagreed with the latest pronunciamentos of scientific thought.

The progress of Rationalism in Germany much resembled the advance of Deism in England. Good and pious men in their frantic endeavors to save something of supernatural religion from utter shipwreck, threw everything overboard until they found they had nothing but Natural Religion, which is but little more than Rationalism pure and simple. Such was the fate of Locke in his attempted answer to Lord Herbert, and such, too, was the fate of Semler, Henke and Ernesti, in their futile attempts to stay the torrent let loose by Lessing and Reimarus. They dissociated religion from theology, and fancied they could save Christianity by rendering it independent of Scripture.

The denial of the inspiration of the Bible was the first step towards the denial of Christianity. The second step was the denial of miracles, and this was made by Eichhorn and Paulus.[1] The latter was deeply imbued with the ideas of Kant, who, according to Lecky, was, with Lessing, the chief leader in Germany in the war against the Bible.[2] The third and last step consisted in denying the authenticity of the Sacred Books, and this radical movement was made by the notorious David Friedrich Strauss. Under the pompous names of Biblical criticism, or critical theology, he brushed aside all that his predecessors had left of the Sacred Text, and made the negation of the supernatural one of his fundamental tenets. What for so many ages have been regarded as undoubted facts and truthful narratives were pronounced by the author of *Das Leben Jesu* myths and mythical legends.[3]

We have briefly traced Rationalism through its full course and found it to issue in Atheism and Nihilism. The doubts of Lessing and the skepticism of Kant led to the negations of Strauss, and the pantheism of Hegel to the atheism of Feuerbach and Schopenhauer.

---

[1] "Melanges Bibliques," *Les Inventeurs de l'Explication Naturelle des Miracles*, par F. Vigouroux.

[2] *History of the Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*, vol. i., p. 289, *et seq.*

[3] *Cf.* Einleitung of *Leben Jesu;* also, Introduction of *Vie de Jesus*, by Ernest Renan. See likewise Rawlinson's *Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scriptures.*

According to these representatives of the most advanced German thought, the value and truth of dogma are to be estimated by its conformity with the latest results of scientific research. The principal dogmas of the Christian faith are belief in a personal God, the creation of the universe out of nothing, and the immortality of the soul. But these beliefs are not in accordance with the teachings of science, and are, therefore, false. Astronomy has driven God from heaven; reason has deprived Him of His court and taken from Him His Angels and His Saints. Geology and palæontology have demonstrated the falsity of the Mosaic cosmogony; linguistics and prehistoric archæology have shown the futility of Biblical chronology; and historical criticism has proved that the Old and New Testaments are nothing more than a tissue of myths and fables. Religion is a bugbear invented by a wily priestcraft; morality is a name for something that does not exist; law and order, restrictions on personal liberty which should not be tolerated.

Such is the last word of modern Rationalism; such the latest utterances of that science that has arrayed itself against the Bible, and against all forms of supernatural religion.

We are now in a position to understand—what would otherwise appear difficult, if not unintelligible—the attitude assumed by so many scientific men in the discussion of all questions that have even a remote bearing on the inspiration and the authenticity of the Scriptures, and on the evidences of revealed religion. They affect to have persuaded themselves, and they try to convince others, that the Bible is false; that Christianity is a concatenation of falsehoods, and that it is the mission of science and of men of science, to proclaim to the world the irreconcilable antagonism between revelation and science, between the teachings of religion and the latest conclusions of modern thought.

It must not, however, be inferred from the foregoing that there is any real antagonism between true science and religious dogma. Not only is this far from being the case, whatever modern rationalists may declare to the contrary, but—what is more—it is impossible. There are, indeed, discrepancies and antagonisms between the Protean theories of science and the teachings of faith, but this, from the very nature of the case, is inevitable. The doctrines of the Church are the expression of Truth itself, and, therefore, immutable. The hypotheses and the speculations which certain scientists set such store by, are as changeable as the colors of the chameleon and as short-lived as the May-fly. Such theories, so often foisted on a credulous world in the name of science are truly characterized in the words of the poet who speaks of

> "Ephemeral monsters, to be seen but once!
> Things that could only show themselves and die."

What we wish specially to direct attention to is the *tendency* of modern science to inculcate Utilitarianism in morals, Materialism in philosophy, and Rationalism and skepticism in religion. True science and true scientists keep aloof from this tendency, but there are many students of Nature who are unconsciously affected by it, even when they are absolutely free from any preconceived notions in their special lines of research. They live in an atmosphere of doubt, and are imbued with the spirit of criticism and Agnosticism which is everywhere rampant. Contrary to their own principles, and in spite of themselves, they are forced into the current of Rationalism, and ere they realize it, they are engulfed in the maelstrom of Materialism or Pantheism.

For, strange as it may appear, and inconsistent as it really is, men of science who are so restive under authority, spiritual or religious, and who are wont to boast of perfect intellectual freedom, are often the greatest slaves to those who for the nonce are saluted as the hierophants of "advanced thought." The influence which Haeckel, Karl Vogt, Büchner, Oscar Schmidt, Paul Bert, Darwin, Huxley, Romanes, Spencer and others of their ilk, have over their followers, even in matters disconnected with the sciences which they profess, is evidence, if any were required, of the truth of this statement.

Contrary to what they assert, modern scientists are often more guided in their investigations by the *magister dixit* of some wild theorist than they are by the facts of science and the indications of Nature. This will explain the variations and contradictions which are so often palmed off on the public as veritable science, and account for the vagaries and absurdities that frequently constitute such a striking characteristic of some of our "advanced thinkers." What on one day obtains universal acquiescence, sinks on the next to complete rejection. For men of science, at least the majority of them, have yet to learn that when they leave the domain of Nature, where their researches should keep them, and enter into the region of speculation, they are, Icarus-like, courting certain failure, if not utter destruction. Their experience is sure to be like that of the Rationalistic school in questions of Scripture and religion,—the verification of the old saying *quot homines tot sententiæ.*

After this rather long preamble, we are now prepared to discuss the historical and the physico-Scriptural question of the antiquity of the human species, and to appreciate many of the aspects of the controversy which would otherwise be ill understood. It will be found that the variations in the history of heresies, so graphically described by Bossuet, are fully paralleled by the various phases assumed by the protracted and heated debate between Biblical

scholars and scientists, regarding the character of Scriptural chronology, especially in its bearing on the always fascinating question of the age of our race.

The first serious onslaught, by men of science, on the Biblical chronology in its relation to the antiquity of man, was inaugurated in the latter part of the last century. The atmosphere was then impregnated with the poison of free thought and irreligion, and the minds of many, even good men, were in a condition of doubt and anxiety bordering almost on despair. It was a period of intellectual as well as of political revolution and anarchy; when the worst elements of society were in the ascendency and were bent on destroying thrones and altars, and removing the last vestiges of the ancient *régime*. Bayle, Voltaire, Rousseau, Condillac, Diderot, Helvetius, D'Alambert, had done their work. The "Encyclopædists," so it seemed, had conquered. Rationalism and Infidelity had triumphed. A new era was to be ushered in, and all traces of the past, in so far as the Church and religion were concerned, were to be consigned to oblivion.

The attack was made in the name of astronomy, and was led by some of the ablest minds of the age. A careful examination of the astronomical tables of the Hindus, it was averred, proved conclusively that the Indian astronomers had made observations on the heavenly bodies full three thousand years before our era, and had cultivated the science of the stars twelve hundred years earlier than their first recorded observations. In other words, it was contended that the Hindus had studied astronomy at least four thousand two hundred years before the Christian era; that, consequently, these people had an antiquity far in excess of that assignable by the usually accepted Scriptural chronology. Professor Playfair, the distinguished Scottish mathematician, in referring to these tables, discloses the animus which actuated himself and his confreres by the statement: "It is through the medium of astronomy *alone* that a few rays from those distant objects" (the primitive inhabitants of India) "can be conveyed in safety to the eye of the modern observer, so as to afford him a light which, though scanty, is pure and unbroken, and free from the false coloring of vanity and superstition."

It was not long, however, before it was demonstrated by some of the more prominent members of the Asiatic Society, notably Mr. Bently, of Calcutta, and by the celebrated French astronomer, Delambre, that the calculations of Playfair, Bailly, and their associates, were based on a myth. It was shown, beyond question, that the earliest reliable astronomical observations of the Hindus as given in their sacred books, do not date back farther than 1421 B.C., and that their oldest extant treatise on astronomy belongs to a period not earlier than 570 A.D.

Shortly after the excitement consequent on the discussion of the Hindu astronomical tables had subsided, a still greater sensation was produced by the finding, by some of the French savants who accompanied Napoleon to Egypt, of the now famous zodiacs of Denderah and Esneh. According to the calculations of certain astronomers and mathematicians, these zodiacs, as well as the temples in which they were found, had an antiquity utterly irreconcilable with any system of chronology that could be deduced from the facts and genealogies of the Old Testament.

The zodiac of Esneh, M. Nouet calculated, dated as far back as 4600 B.C., whilst M. Burkard's computations assigned it to a period about seven thousand years before our era. According to a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, the zodiacs of Denderah could not "be referred to a period much later than three thousand eight hundred years ago," whereas that of Esneh was given an antiquity of "more than five thousand three hundred years." M. Dupuis went much further, and estimated that the temples, in which the zodiacs were discovered, must have a minimum age of fifteen thousand years. "I have," he exclaimed, with self-complacency, "cast the anchor of truth into the ocean of time." But, as the sequel showed, he was mistaken. His ocean of time proved to be an ocean of error.

"It was then," remarks a sagacious writer, commenting on the zodiacs, and the speculations to which they gave rise, "that science struck out into very bold systems, and the spirit of infidelity seizing upon the discovery, flattered itself with the hope of drawing from it new support." The enemies of religion and the Bible again raised a cry of victory, and gravely announced that the Christian chronology was a thing of the past.

But the shout of triumph, as in the case of the Hindu tables, was premature; for just when the infidels of France and England were rapturously singing their pæans of congratulation, a young man—a scholar and an explorer—arrived from Egypt, bringing with him incontestable evidence that the calculations which assigned such great antiquity to the temples and zodiacs of Denderah and Esneh were entirely illusory, and were utterly without foundation in fact. The young man's name was Jean François Champollion, the father of Egyptology, whose genius had unraveled the mysteries of the hieroglyphics that before his time disclosed as little regarding the past history of Nile-land, its monuments, and its inhabitants, as the Sphinx itself. He had studied the zodiacs *in situ*, and was able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of even the most critical that, far from having the hoary antiquity claimed for them, they did not antedate the first two centuries. They did not belong to the times of some of the earlier Pharaohs, as many stoutly main-

tained, but were put in place during the Roman domination in Egypt, and sometime during or between the reigns of Tiberius and Antoninus Pius.

The warfare waged in the name of astronomy against the Biblical chronology was a signal failure. But, nothing daunted, the enemies of the Church betook themselves to a new arsenal, from which they fondly hoped to draw more effective arms. These arsenals were the histories and literatures of certain of the Oriental nations, especially India, China, Egypt, and Assyria.

Hindu literature and history, whose vast treasures had just been opened up to European scholars, seemed to promise them all they could desire. The poems, mythologies, and the genealogical list of kings, as given in the Vedas, Purânas and Sûtras were carefully scrutinized and compared; but the results arrived at, when above mere conjecture, were far from reliable or satisfactory to those who were in quest of weapons which they could use against the Christian cause.

Sir William Jones, the great Orientalist, and certainly no friend of the Church, was the first to make a serious attempt to unravel the intricate web of Indian chronology. In his examination of Sanskrit records, he met with absurdities and contradictions innumerable, but still, far from despairing, he pursued his inquiries with a persistence and an enthusiasm that must extort admiration even from his bitterest adversary.

And what was the result of his investigations? One that was a grievous disappointment to the anti-Christian theorizers of his time, but one that was quite in consonance with the chronology of the Bible. Accepting as legitimate the conclusions of a prejudiced investigator, but one who was remarkably well qualified to give an opinion on the question under discussion, "we have the establishment of a government in that country [India] no earlier than 2000 years before Christ, the age of Abraham, when the book of Genesis represents Egypt as possessing an established dynasty, and commerce and literature already flourishing in Phœnicia."[1]

Wilfort, Klaproth, Heeren, and others, continued the work inaugurated by Sir William Jones, and with essentially the same results. Heeren, after making a thorough examination of the Hindu writings, gives it as his opinion that "we cannot expect to find in them any critical or chronological history; it is one by poets composed, and by poets preserved." And so completely are the early annals of India involved in mythological fable, that Klaproth does not hesitate to bring down the commencement of true chronological history to a period as late as the twelfth century of our era.

---

[1] Cardinal Wiseman's *Science and Revealed Religion*, vol. ii., p. 33.

The erudite Lassen, as the fruit of most laborious and extended researches in Indian history and literature, arrives at conclusions which admirably harmonize with those of his predecessors whom we have just named. He places the date of the establishment of regular government in India somewhere between 2000 and 1500 B.C., a date quite in keeping with even the most conservative system of Scriptural chronology.

According to some of the most recent authorities on the subject —Kruse and Littré, for instance—none of the Hindu records deserve the name of history. They are enveloped in a poetical mantle of myth that utterly precludes any determination of time, or the establishment of any date which could serve as a certain basis of a system of chronology that would be even approximately correct.

According to Max Müller, the oldest of the Vedas, which are the most ancient monuments of Sanskrit literature, belong to a period not anterior to twelve or fifteen hundred years before the Christian era. For a long time the Laws of Manu—the Manava-dharma-sastra—were, like the Vedic hymns, supposed to have a venerable antiquity. Sir William Jones fixed their date at 1280, and Elphinstone at 900 B.C. The learned Oxford philologist, in referring to them, says: "I doubt whether, in their present form, they can be older than the fourth century of our era; nay, I am prepared to see an even later date assigned to them. I know this will be heresy to many Sanskrit scholars, but we must try to be honest to ourselves."[1]

The utter impossibility of constructing anything like a chronological history of India from the materials supplied has been fully acknowledged by one who was singularly well qualified to express an opinion on the question. We refer to the distinguished scholar and Orientalist, M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire. Writing in the *Journal des Savants*, in reference to the subject we are now considering, he declares that everywhere in the world of India, except in Ceylon "history is entirely absent, or if it tries to show itself, it is so disfigured that it is absolutely unrecognizable. Who in the legends of the epic poems, the Brahmanas, the Purânas, is able to discover an historical tradition? Is it possible, even according to the most liberal system of interpretation, to extract therefrom anything precise, anything real? The most important events of Brahmanic society are obscured by an impenetrable darkness which time intensifies instead of diminishing. In spite of all our erudition, so powerful and so sure, we must despair of resuscitating that past which was annihilated by the very ones who were its chief

[1] *India: What it Can Teach Us.* Lecture iii.

actors. India has not willed to awake from her dreams; we cannot historically call her from her tomb."—March, 1866, pp. 164–165.

A careful study, therefore, of the astronomy, the literature, and what there is of the history of the Hindus leads us to the same conclusion at which the learned Cardinal Wiseman arrived more than a half a century ago. In his admirable lectures on "The Connection between Science and Revealed Religion,"—which, notwithstanding the remarkable strides science has made since 1835, when the lectures were delivered, is still in many respects, a standard work on the topics treated,—this scholarly prince of the Church, summarizes in one sentence, what may be said on the subject of the antiquity of the Hindus, when he says: "Instead of the six thousand years before Alexander, attributed by some writers, on the credit of Arrian, or the millions deduced from the fables of the Brahmans, we have, as Jones and others had conjectured, the age of Abraham, as the earliest historical epoch of an organized community in India."[1]

The boasted antiquity of the Chinese fares no better in the hands of modern historical criticism. As in the case of the Hindus, national pride and ambition impelled the Chinese to claim an extravagant remoteness of time for their origin and for the beginnings of their history. It is the boast of the Chinese that theirs is the oldest nation of the globe; and, if we are to credit their annalists, the history of the Celestial Empire stretches back to the venerable antiquity of three million two hundred and seventy-six thousand years before the Christian era. Like the Hindus, the Chinese tell us that, in the earliest times, their country was governed by celestial rulers, or demigods, and their historians gravely give us long lists of kings and dynasties whose reigns extend over tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of years.

When, however, we come to sift truth from fable, and determine how much of historical fact there is in their fanciful mythological creations, we find that the epoch to be assigned to the commencement of sober history is very recent indeed.

We are indebted to the Jesuit missionaries for the first reliable data bearing on the history of China. The learned chronologist, Father Gaubil, as the result of calculations based on certain eclipses mentioned in Chinese annals, is disposed to regard the date when the emperor Yao ascended the throne, as the first event that can be fixed with any degree of accuracy. According to the computations of this able Sinologue, the date in question is to be assigned to the year 2357 B.C.

Father Gaubil's chronological views were endorsed by many

[1] *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 37.

competent critics; but a number of eminent scholars who have made a careful study of the many difficulties involved in determining any of the remote dates of Chinese records, think that the earliest date of authentic history belongs to a period far more recent.

The oldest of the classical books of China is the Chou-King, by the celebrated philosopher, Confucius, which is alleged to give the history of the country between 2357 and 627 B.C.; but even those who are favorable to the great antiquity of the Celestial Empire are forced to admit that the Chou-King does not afford us a means of establishing a system of chronology for the long period of time which it embraces.

If there is no satisfactory evidence for the great antiquity of China, so often claimed for it, in the native records, there is still less in the annals of any of the ancient nations of the world with which China may reasonably be supposed, if so ancient as she pretends to be, to have been in communication. Thus Chabas has shown that the monuments of Ancient Egypt include no mention of the Celestial Empire, although there are references made to all other then known peoples.

Klaproth, who devoted special study to the subject of Chinese history, denies the existence of historical certainty in the annals of China prior to the year 782 before Christ,—"pretty nearly the era of the foundation of Rome, when Hebrew literature was already on the decline." In this view he is followed by Lassen, who does not hesitate to declare that the Chinese have no authentic history before the beginning of the eighth century before the Christian era. As a matter of conjecture, he fixes the first dynasty of the Celestial Empire, that of Hia, at a period not antedating the year 2205 B.C.

At all events, whatever may be the antiquity of the Chinese as a race,—and it does not appear that we shall ever have more light on the subject than we possess at present,—we can heartily subscribe to the opinion of the erudite Abbé Vigouroux, who confidently affirms that there is nothing in Chinese chronology which proves that China as a nation dates back to the time of Noah, and that we have in the chronology of the Septuagint all the time required for the development of its history.

A special interest has always centered in Egypt, for the reason that generations before India and China were known, the land of the Nile was regarded as the cradle of civilization. As far back as we can penetrate into her dim and distant history, we find her in full possession of that religion and of those arts and monuments which, from the earliest times, have ever remained the enigma of travellers and scholars. We know nothing of the infancy of her

strange people. From the most remote ages they appear to us in full maturity, and in all the splendor of their marvellous powers.

Long anterior to the Hebrew Exodus, before Abraham visited the land of the Pharoahs, Egypt was old, and the seat of a government that had endured through many and powerful dynasties. Centuries before "the Father of the Faithful" had left Ur of the Chaldees, the pyramids of Gizeh, looking down upon the broad valley of the Nile to the east and the great Libyan desert to the west, stood as monuments that were then the evidence and the pride of a great nation, as they were the wonder and the inspiration of Napoleon and his warriors; and this at a period so long subsequent that nothing remained to attest the pristine glory of two of the nation's greatest capitals, both within sight of Cheops and his companions, but a mutilated sphynx where Memphis once stood, and a solitary obelisk on the site of Heliopolis.

Our knowledge of Egyptian chronology is derived from three different sources: from Greek travellers who visited the land of the Nile; from the historian Manetho, an Egyptian priest, born about 300 B.C., who wrote in Greek a history of his country under the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus; and from various original monuments, papyri, and inscriptions, the most important of which have been brought to light during the present century.

Relying on information obtained from the priests of Heliopolis, Solon and Herodotus attributed to Egypt a very high antiquity. According to the former, the Egyptian monarchy stretched back full nine thousand years, while according to the latter the earliest annals of the Egyptian kings dated from an epoch more than two thousand years earlier. Historians, however, have given little credence to the opinions of the Greeks regarding the age of Egypt as a nation, and, hence, we may dismiss what they have to say on the subject without further comment.

Manetho's history, unfortunately, has been lost, and all of it that has come down to us are the lists of kings and dynasties as preserved in the works of Julius Africanus, Eusebius and Syncellus. Like the Indian and Chinese authors, Manetho gives, as the first rulers of his country, long dynasties of gods and heroes. The reign of the gods, according to him, lasted no less than thirteen thousand nine hundred years,—far from the hundreds of thousands and millions of years claimed for the reigns of their gods by the Chinese and Hindu writers, but a long period in comparison with the time allowed to the reign of the kings of whom we have authentic records.

Rejecting as mythical the reigns of gods and demi-gods, the majority of critics are disposed to regard as historic the thirty dynasties of Manetho, which begin with Menes, the first ruler of

Egypt, and end with Nectanebo II. In his scheme of chronology, the Egyptian historian purposes giving not only the number of dynasties, but also the greater part of the names of the kings belonging to them, together with the duration of their reigns and the order of their succession.

But an objection to Manetho's lists is that he enumerates all the dynasties as if they were successive, whereas it is well known by all students of Egyptian history that several of the dynasties were contemporaneous. Again, he never speaks of two rulers being associated on the throne, when we know, from incontestable evidence, that in several instances two kings occupied the throne at the same time. A notable case in point is that afforded by the joint reign of Seti I. and his famous son,—often called the Napoleon of ancient Egypt,—Rameses II. A third objection is that he frequently exaggerates the length of time during which his monarchs bore sway. For this reason critics generally are of the opinion that the lists of Manetho require the control and support of other and more authentic sources of information. These are supplied by various papyri, inscriptions and monuments.

Undoubtedly the most important, as well as the most authentic chronological record yet discovered, is the celebrated Turin papyrus. It gives a list of those who ruled from the time of the gods and heroes to the epoch of the Hyksos, or Shepherd kings. Of the greatest value, so far as it goes, it unfortunately exists only in tattered fragments and lacks completeness. For this reason Brugsch, in his "History of Egypt under the Pharaohs," says of it: "As the case stands at present, no mortal man possesses the means of removing the difficulties which are inseparable from the attempt to restore the original list of kings from the fragments of the Turin papyrus. Far too many of the most necessary elements are wanting to fill up the *lacunæ*."

Besides the Turin papyrus, we have the tables of Abydos, Sakkarah, and Karnak, and others of less importance, all of which have been discovered in various parts of the Nile valley within the past few decades. They exhibit the cartouches of a large number of the rulers of Egypt, as well as their order of succession, and, in spite of certain omissions and discrepancies, are invaluable to the student of Egyptian history and chronology.[1]

But important as are the records just mentioned, they do not by any means enable us to construct a system of chronology that can be considered even approximately correct. They tell us, indeed, how long each king reigned and how long each Apis lived, but they do not inform us as to the connection of the reign of any one

[1] *Cf.* Lenormant's *Histoire Ancienne de l' Orient*, tome ii., pp. 37 *et seq.*

sovereign with that of the ruler who preceded or followed him; of the time that elapsed between one Apis and the next in succession. Neither do they give us any direct information regarding the time during which a sovereign was alone on the throne, and when he had a coadjutor. It is certain that there was a number of simultaneous dynasties, but just how many there were is still a matter of great diversity of opinion. According to Lenormant there were but two; according to Brugsch, five; Lieblein and Bunsen admit seven, while Poole and Wilkinson extend the number to twelve.

"The greatest obstacle in the way of establishing a regular Egyptian chronology," says the accomplished Egyptologist, Mariette, "is the fact that the Egyptians themselves had no chronology." And they had no chronology because they had no era. Hence, as Mariette well observes: "Whatever be the apparent precision of our computations, modern science will always fail in any attempt to restore that which the Egyptians never possessed."[1]

According to M. de Rougé, the first event to which a certain date can be assigned is the expulsion, in the year 665 B.C., of the Ethiopians by Psamatik I., of the twenty-sixth dynasty.[2] In this opinion Mariette, Brugsch, and others fully concur. There are numerous documents belonging to this period which put the matter beyond doubt. Besides, Egypt was then in constant communication with Greece, so that we have information from the writers of the latter, as well as from the monuments of the former nation, of events that occurred during this period in the land of the Pharaohs.

Astronomical calculations, based on the heliacal rising of Sothis —Sirius—enable us, with some degree of exactness, to carry back the chronology of Egypt to the year 1322 before the Christian era.[3] There are some historians who incline to the belief that we can go back still further—to the eighteenth or nineteenth century B.C., about the time of the expulsion of the Hyksos.

Beyond this all is conjecture, and we enter into the region of what De Rougé has designated "uncertain chronology." Authorities and monuments are vague and conflicting. In numerous cases it is impossible to decide whether certain dynasties were successive or contemporary; whether they bore rule over the whole of the Nile valley, or whether, as in certain undoubted instances, their authority was limited to only a small portion of the Delta.

---

[1] *Apercu de l'Histoire d'Egypte*, p. 66.

[2] *Cf.* Felix Robiou, a disciple of De Rougé, in his scholarly article, "Chronologie de l'Egypte," in the admirable *Dictionaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*, par l'Abbé J. B. Jaugey.

[3] See *Le Monde et l'Homme Primitif selon la Bible*, par Mgr. Meignan, pp. 333 *et seq.*

It is these *lacunæ*, imperfections and contradictions in all existing records that render so difficult the construction of a system of chronology, and that have given rise to so many and such diverse estimates regarding the age of Egypt as a nation.

Wilkinson assigns the date at which Menes, the first monarch of the first dynasty, ascended the throne, to the year 2691 B.C., while Stewart Poole fixes on the year 2717 B.C. as the date of this event. Bunsen makes the figure 3051 or 3623; Lepsius, 3852; Lieblein, 3893; Pessl, 3917; Chabas, 4000; Lauth, 4157; Brugsch, 4455; Lenormant and Mariette, 5004; Unger, 5613, and Böckh, 5702. This, as Rawlinson well observes, "is as if the best authorities upon Roman history were to tell us, some of them, that the republic was founded in B.C. 508, and others in B.C. 3508."[1]

How long the Egyptians were in the valley of the Nile before Menes ascended the throne is, if anything, a still more vexed question. Prof. Owens claims 7000 years as the time that has elapsed since the origin of primitive Egyptian civilization. Others demand 10,000 and 15,000 years, while Baron Bunsen puts the figures at 20,000 years.

With such conflicting data before us, furnished by those who are most competent to pronounce judgment in the premises, it were unwise for us to attempt to untie the Gordian knot. One of the latest authorities on the subject, the learned Egyptologist, M. Felix Robiou, says in reference to the question: "We do not know even approximately the duration of the history of the Pharaohs; but the least improbable conjecture, one which cannot be far from the truth, is that it commenced in the fourth millennium before the Christian era, possibly in the first part of this millennium."[2] The Abbé Vigouroux, is disposed to accept a still higher figure, and to admit that the reign of Menes dates from a period 5000 years B.C. But even granting this figure to be correct, he insists that "Genesis properly understood allows Egyptologists full liberty to attribute to Egypt any antiquity that a just study of its monuments may demand."[3]

How long the descendants of Noah had been established in the valley of the Nile before the time of Menes is a question on which the monuments of Egypt throw no light whatever. It may have been but a few, and again it may have been several centuries. But, whatever time may have elapsed between the advent of the Noachidae and the accession of Menes to the throne, we can rest quite assured that when we shall have full information on the sub-

---

[1] See *History of Ancient Egypt*, chap. xii.

[2] *Dictionaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique*, *loc. cit.*

[3] *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, October, 1886, p. 400.

ject, Egyptian chronology on the one hand and Biblical chronology on the other, will be found to be in perfect harmony.

During the past fifty years much valuable information regarding the antiquity and early history of our race has been gleaned from investigations which have been conducted and discoveries which have been made in various parts of Western Asia, and notably in the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Prior to this period our knowledge of the language and literature, as well as of the history of Chaldea, Assyria and Babylonia was as limited as was that which was had of Egypt before the famous discoveries of Champollion, Young and Rosellini.

It is true that Berosus, a priest of Belus, at Babylon, had, about 250 B.C., written in Greek a history of Babylonia, but of it nothing is now extant except a few fragments preserved in the writings of Apollodorus, Polyhistor, Eusebius, Syncellus and a few of the early Greek Fathers. Enough, however, is known of his chronology, to convince us that it is no more deserving of credence than that of Manetho. Both cater to the vanity of their countrymen by assigning a fabulous antiquity to their respective nations, and by making their earliest rulers gods and heroes. But whereas Manetho is satisfied with an antiquity of 30,000 years for his country up to the time of Alexander the Great, Berosus carries the history of Babylonia back to a period antedating the Christian era by over 468,000 years. According to this annalist there were ten kings before the Flood, whose aggregate reigns had a duration of 432,000 years. It is no wonder, then, that even the old Greeks and Romans, addicted as they were to myths and fables, felt themselves called upon to reject such pretensions as absurd.[1]

But although the first part of the lists of Berosus, like the first part of Manetho's lists, is mythical, the latter portions of his chronological scheme, like that of the Egyptian historian, is substantially correct, at least so far as concerns the time demanded for the various dynasties and rulers mentioned. According to Rawlinson, the earliest historical date of Berosus is about 2458 B.C., considerably more remote than the earliest authentic date of Egyptian history.

It is, however, from the inscriptions on tablets, cylinders, and other monuments that have been discovered where once stood the flourishing cities of Assur, Sippara, Erech, Accad, and those famous capitals of the ancient world, Nineveh and Babylon, not to speak of numerous other localities in western Asia, that we derive

[1] Cicero in his work *De Divinatione*, in referring to the Chaldeans, says of them: "Condemnemus hos aut stultitiae aut vanitatis aut impudentiae, qui CCCCLXX millia annorum ut ipsi dicunt monumentis comprehensa continent et mentiri judicemus."

our most accurate knowledge regarding the antiquity as well as the history of the peoples who, in ages long past, constituted the great kingdoms of Chaldea, Babylonia, and Assyria.

And here we meet with new triumphs of erudition and genius that remind us of the wonderful achievements that have rendered the name of Champollion immortal. For centuries past specimens of wedge-writing, or nail-like inscriptions, found among the ruins of various cities of the Orient, had attracted the attention of scholars and travellers, but, until a few decades ago, the meaning of these strange figures was involved in even greater mystery than that which enveloped the hieroglyphics of the temples and obelisks of the land of the Pharaohs. To the wondering Arab they were the work of the genii, while to the European they were often but the expression of the fantasy of some architect who wished to show in how many different ways he could combine these nail-like forms.[1]

In 1765, during his journeyings in the east, Karsten Niebuhr, the father of the illustrious historian, copied some of the inscriptions at Persepolis, and offered several theories regarding them which subsequent investigators have confirmed. Scholars in various parts of Europe now became interested in cuneiform writing, but all attempts to decipher them were fruitless. A Champollion was required for the task, but he appeared not. A genius like his is vouchsafed to the world only at rare intervals.

In 1802 Grotefend succeeded in making out the names of Darius and Xerxes, and thus supplied a key for the reading of the cuneiform characters, as Champollion at a later date discovered the key to the Egyptian hieroglyphics by deciphering the names of Ptolemy and Cleopatra on the now famous Rosetta Stone. But Grotefend's work was far from being as thorough as Champollion's. While the former was able to read but a few names—he never accomplished more—the latter was fortunate enough, unaided and alone, to decipher not only the writing of ancient Egypt, but also to resuscitate its grammar and language as well.

A third of a century elapsed before anything further was done. At the end of this period, Burnouf in France, and Lassen in Germany, independently and almost simultaneously, announced the discovery of the alphabet of the trilingual inscriptions of Persepolis. This was a giant step forward, and contributed materially towards the solution of a problem on which, for a long time, some of the keenest intellects of Europe had been engaged.

The next great advance made was the publication, in 1857, in the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," by Sir Henry Rawlinson,

---

[1] *Cf.* Vigouroux's *La Bible et les Deconvertes Modernes*, tome i., pp. 34 *et seq.*

of the Babylonian text of the trilingual inscription of Darius on the rock of Behistun. This rock often, and justly so, called the Rosetta Stone of Assyriology, had on it inscriptions in three different languages, ancient Persian and Medic, and Babylonian or Assyrian. As soon as the Babylonian text was deciphered by the brilliant English colonel, a key was supplied for the interpretation of the thousands of unilingual inscriptions found everywhere along the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates.

These conquests of genius, added to Botta's discovery, a few years before, of the ruins of Nineveh, which for nearly twenty-five centuries was so effectually buried under the earth that even its site was unknown, spurred on antiquaries and explorers to new achievements, and a long succession of triumphs was the result. Botta had unearthed the palace of Sargon and discovered a large number of tablets and inscriptions of the utmost value. Layard, Loftus, Place, Oppert, George Smith, Hormuzd Rassam and others followed him and exhumed monuments and palaces which were bewildering in their number, extent and magnificence.[1]

But by far the most important discovery, the one in which we are at present most interested, and the one which, more than all the others combined, contributed to put Assyriology on a firm and permanent basis, one which has proved of untold value to biblical students, was the discovery by Layard, in 1850, of the celebrated library of Assurbanipal.

This library was one of many that formerly existed in all the large cities of Chaldea and Assyria, but the only one that so so far has been discovered, and probably the only one that has been preserved.[1] The Assyrians had neither papyrus, like the Egyptians, nor parchment, like the Greeks and Romans, nor paper, such as we possess. Their books were composed of tablets of baked clay, *coctiles laterculi*, Pliny calls them—a fortunate circumstance, no doubt, as they would doubtless have otherwise been destroyed long centuries ago. As it is, we have a great portion of them, and many of them in a good state of preservation.

Assurbanipal—the Sardanapalus of the Greeks, the *grand monarque* of Assyria, the patron of art, science, and literature—had in his library, besides works on history, astronomy, astrology, theology, politics, geography, and other branches of knowledge, a valuable collection of syllabaries, grammars, and dictionaries, which the Assyrians themselves had used in learning the significance of the symbols, and in mastering the difficulties of their written lan-

[1] *Cf.* Rawlinson's *Seven Great Monarchies*, Assyria, chap. vi., and Lenormant's *Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, tome iv., chap. iv.

[2] The noted German writer, Scholz, speaks of it as "Eine Bibliothek aus dem 9. Jahrhunderte v. Chr., und zwar Alles im Original.

guage. By means of the contents of this library—undoubtedly the oldest in the world—which Providence at an opportune moment placed in the hands of the scholars of Europe, Assyriologists were able to lift all that was left of the veil that still obscured the secrets of the mysterious wedge-writing of western Asia. In the words of Maspero[2]: "In less than thirty years, a new world of languages and of peoples, before unknown, was discovered; thirty centuries of history were brought from the tomb to the full light of day."

To realize fully the extent of this wonderful find, it is sufficient to state that the number of tablets estimated to have existed originally in the royal library of Nineveh was not less than ten thousand. According to Mr. Birch, there were, in 1872, about twenty thousand fragments of these tablets in the British Museum, not to speak of the countless fragments in other museums, and in the possession of private individuals in various parts of the world. It has been computed that these books of baked clay, before the destruction of the library, would have made full five hundred printed quarto volumes of five hundred pages each.

The books of this wonderful library, relating to the manners and customs, the religion, science, and governments of the ancient peoples who inhabited the lands watered by the Tigris and the Euphrates, are interesting and valuable, but the tablets bearing astronomical records are, for our present purpose, far more important. Thanks to the computations and tabular statements of the old Chaldean astronomers, we are now able to fix the dates of many historical facts of Babylonian history as far back as the sixth century B.C., with almost mathematical precision.

It had long been known that the origin of astronomy could be traced to Mesopotamia, and that the Chaldeans were the first astronomers. But beyond this general fact all was fancy and conjecture. Few or no details were known or available. About all that could be said on the subject was included in the following poetical paragraph of Lalande's "Astronomie," which was published more than a hundred years ago:

"The inhabitants of the vast plains of Sennaar, where was built the city of Babylon, were, according to many savants, the oldest astronomers, and the first of all observers; at least their observations are the oldest which have come down to us. Everything concurred to direct their attention towards the heavens. The care of their flocks was their principal occupation. But the heat of the day made them select the night for their labors and their journey-

---

[1] *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient.* Quatrieme edition, 1886. Appendice, p. 712.

ings, so that the spectacle of the heavenly bodies forced itself, as it were, on their attention, in spite of themselves."

Within the last few years, however, a great advance has been made in our knowledge respecting the beginnings of the science of astronomy, and our information regarding the early work and methods of the first of the world's star-gazers is comparatively complete. The learned palæographists and mathematicians, Fathers Strassmaier and Epping of the Society of Jesus, as the result of a careful decipherment of some of the cuneiform inscriptions found in the library of Assurbanipal, and of a series of long and complicated calculations that only astronomers can fully appreciate, have demonstrated conclusively, that, as far back as the sixth century before our era, the astronomers of Babylonia had a very accurate knowledge of the science of the stars, and that they made observations of the eclipses of the sun and moon, of the oppositions and conjunctions of the planets, and of some of the stars, with a degree of accuracy that is simply marvellous. More than this, they had a calendar remarkable for its exactness, and a collection of tables based on observations and calculations, that approximated, in many respects, to our modern ephemeris.[1]

But remote as is the past to which the tablets of the Chaldean astronomer convey back the chronologist, there is reason to believe that new discoveries will supply still other dates of a much greater antiquity. The study of Chaldean astronomy from cuneiform inscriptions is but in its infancy, and yet it has already disclosed a number of facts of which not even the most sanguine Assyriologist ever dreamed. One of these facts, and it is of paramount importance, is that the Assyrians, and the same may be said of the Chaldeans and Babylonians, had a chronological sense, something, which, as we have seen, was entirely wanting to the ancient Hindus, Chinese and Egyptians. This fact, if no other, should inspire more confidence in the chronological records of Assyria, Chaldea and Babylonia than we are warranted in feeling in those of any of the other ancient peoples of the Orient.

The Assyrians, unlike the Egyptians and Chinese, did not reckon time by the years during which their kings held the sceptre, but rather by the names of eponym officials, called *limmu*, who, like the archons at Athens, and the consuls at Rome, gave their names to the years during which they held office. By means of eponym canons, or lists, some of which have been preserved, we are able to

---

[1] See *Astronomie a Babylone*, by the Rev. J. D. Lucas, S.J., *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, October, 1890, and April, 1891. Also, by the same writer, *Ephemerides Planetaires des Chaldéens* in the same *Revue* for January, 1892. Consult likewise *Astronomisches aus Babylon order das Wissen der Chaldäer uber den gestirnten Himmel*, by Fathers Strassmaier and Epping, S.J, published in 1889 as a supplement to the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*.

assign, with comparative certainty, the dates of events that occurred at very remote periods of Assyrian history.

Thus, from inscriptions at hand, we know that the institution of the *limmu* dates as far back as the fourteenth century B.C., and there are valid reasons for believing that it existed long prior to this epoch. Other inscriptions that Assyriologists seem disposed to credit, carry us back to the year 2274 before our era, while the celebrated tablet of Nabonidos, about which so much has been written, gives us a date nearly fifteen centuries more remote. This remarkable monument, now preserved in the British museum, seems to fix the date of the reign of Sargon I., the father of Narsam-Sin, at about thirty-eight centuries before the Christian era, a date much earlier than was formerly attributed to this sovereign.[1]

According to the testimony of other monuments, quite a number of kings occupied the throne during the time that intervened between the reign of Sargon I., and the deluge of Noah. This, contrary to the generally received opinion, would place the flood at a period 4000 years B.C., at least, and possibly, at a date much earlier. Certain inscriptions from the library of Assurbampal, relating to the Deluge, and deciphered by Mr. George Smith[2] led Sir Henry Rawlinson, than whom no one is more competent to express an opinion on the subject, to ascribe to the great cataclysm, so graphically described in Genesis, a date preceding our era by six or seven thousand years.

Whatever of truth there may be in Rawlinson's estimate, it seems certain that Assyriologists are able to carry back the history of our race to a more remote period than can possibly, with any show of reason, be claimed for it by the chronologies of India, China or Egypt. And it appears quite reasonable that this should be so. Central Asia, if not Mesopotamia, according to tradition and science, was most likely the birth-place of the human species, and hence, it seems reasonable that the people who inhabited the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates should have a greater antiquity than those who lived in the land of the Nile, or in regions more distant from the first home of the race. If, therefore, it should be proven that Egypt had a civilization antedating the Christian era by 5000 years and more, as many suppose, we should be quite warranted in claiming for the ancient peoples of Mesopotamia a civilization several centuries older and thus fixing the be-

---

[1] Lenormant, *Histoire Ancienne de l' Orient*, tome v., p. 79, in referring to this tablet observes: "Si cette indication est exacte, comme rien ne s'y oppose, Naram-Sin regnait vers 3750 et Sargon, son pere, vers 3800 avant J.C.; c'est la plus ancienne date certaine de l'histoire." Mr. Sayce, the distinguished English Assyriologist, hesitates about accepting this date as reliable.

[2] *Cf. Les Premieres Civilizations* par François Lenormant, tome ii., *Le Deluge et l'Epopée Babylonienne.*

ginnings of its history somewhere near unto six millennia before the time of Christ.

Linguistics and ethnology tell the same story as history and astronomy. They demand a greater antiquity for mankind than Biblical scholars have hitherto been disposed to concede.[1] Like history and astronomy they seem to fix the dispersion of the sons of Noah about five or six thousand years B.C., a much longer period than is indicated by any of the versions of the Bible as usually interpreted. Adding this time to the two thousand years that are ordinarily supposed to have elapsed between the creation of Adam and the Deluge, and the nineteen centuries that date from the coming of Christ, we have for the age of the human race, a period that covers nearly ten thousand years.

It cannot be urged that our figures are too liberal. On the contrary the estimate is rather conservative. There are many, as we have seen, and we have mentioned but a few of those, who have studied the question, who insist on it that history and astronomy, as well as linguistics and ethnology, teach us that man has been on the earth fifteen or twenty thousand years, if not more. But even these figures, high as they are, are small in comparison with those furnished us by geology and prehistoric archæology.

How reconcile these dates and figures with Scriptural chronology? Are not the Bible and science hopelessly at variance in regard to the antiquity of man, and have we not here at least an instance of that irreconcilable conflict, we hear so much of, between the certain results of modern scientific research, and the inspired record? We do not think so. On the contrary, we are firmly convinced that a careful and unprejudiced study of the question of man's antiquity will issue in proving, as has been so often done heretofore, in other matters, that the Bible and science are at one regarding the question now under discussion, and will eventually render the same testimony.

Before, however, attempting to demonstrate the truth of this proposition, we shall take up certain objections that are deemed more formidable than any that have yet been urged, and which, during the past third of a century, especially, have attracted an attention, and assumed an importance, that render all other difficulties comparatively insignificant. The objections referred to are presented in the names of geology and that newer science, prehistoric archæology. But space prevents their examination at present, and we must, therefore, reserve a discussion of this, the most interesting portion of our thesis, for a subsequent article.

JOHN A. ZAHNS.

[1] *Cf.* Mgr. Harlez in *La Controverse*, 1881, pp. 577, 578; also the admirable criticism, by the learned Father Vanden Gheyn, S.J., of the *Origines Ariacæ* of Karl Penka, in the *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, p. 605, April, 1884.

THE HIGH CHURCH POSITION UNTENABLE.[1]

THAT aggregate of separate ecclesiastical societies called the Anglican Communion is divided into three great parties—the High Church, the Low Church and the Broad Church. The *differentia* of the High Church party is the doctrine that a visible body, founded on an episcopate deriving its authority through successive ordinations from the Apostles, is the medium through which God imparts grace and salvation to men. The Low Church party rejects this doctrine, and is in general assimilated to that class of Protestants who call themselves "evangelical." The Broad Church is low but rationalistic.

There are many varieties of high churchmanship, produced by lesser or greater approximation to Catholicism; of late years many have preferred to be called "Anglo-Catholics," and the most advanced are now usually called "Ritualists." When the independence of the United States had been acknowledged, and the Archbishop of Canterbury was authorized by Parliament to give episcopal consecration to three bishops-elect for American Episcopalians, these three prelates, together with one other who had already been consecrated in Scotland, proceeded in unison with their presbyters and the representatives of the laity to organize that Protestant Episcopal Church which has since become one of the principal Protestant denominations in the United States. From the beginning there has been a considerable and growing High Church party in this communion, which has kept up a strong and aggressive controversy with other Protestant denominations whose organization is Presbyterian. Their champions laid themselves out chiefly in proving the doctrine of apostolical succession, the necessity of episcopal ordination for a lawful and valid ministry, and the primitive apostolic origin of liturgical forms and ceremonies in Christian worship. With their high view of the nature and office of the Church was also necessarily connected a conception of the sacerdotal character of the Christian ministry and of sacramental grace imparted through baptism and the Holy Eucharist. The strict and logical churchmen denied all right to the non-episcopal societies to claim for themselves any church prerogatives. The Roman Church was mostly disregarded, and in face of the Protestant sects the Protestant Episcopal Church was

[1] *Life of William Rollinson Whittingham, Fourth Bishop of Maryland.* By William Francis Brand. 2d. ed. New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co. 1886.

proclaimed to be the only true and apostolic church in the country, the one fold of Christ to which all the scattered sheep, with their self-constituted shepherds, were bound to resort. In England, the Established Church is, in the eye of the law, the *Church of England*, and all those who do not belong to it are regarded as dissenters. The little daughter of the Church of England was exalted by her devoted adherents to a similar position of majesty, as the heiress of her queenly mother. The cause of episcopacy, as against presbytery, was sustained very successfully by a number of able men, who gained many converts, by whom the ranks of the clergy and laity were recruited. One of the colonial presidents of Yale College, Dr. Cutler, had previously gone to England, and receiving his orders there, had become one of the founders of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, which had grown and thriven under the administration of Bishop Seabury. In Boston, the reminiscence of the vice-regal court gave to that Church, which had been the Church of the English, prestige and importance. It had gained from an early period a strong foothold in New York, and this was strengthened by the large property acquired by Trinity Church. In Virginia and Maryland it had been by law established, and had the advantage of tradition on its side. Probably the dignity and decorum of its rites and ceremonies, together with the absence of repulsive Calvinistic dogmatism and of the violent style of revival preachers in the sermons of the clergy had more influence than any other cause to attract sober-minded people, persons of good taste and cultivation, and all who were weary of the spiritual despotism, the dreary modes of worship, the gloomy doctrines of Puritanism and Presbyterianism.

So long as the Catholic Church was out of sight and out of mind, and it could be taken for granted that the Church of England had preserved a true succession from her ancient Catholic episcopate, her American daughter seemed to have a fair field before her.

But the case was altered when the Oxford movement and the growing importance of the Catholic Church in English-speaking countries brought the High Church claims face to face with those of an older and wider episcopacy, and with the claims of Rome as the Mother and Mistress of churches.

It was at this period that the subject of Mr. Brand's biography began his ecclesiastical career. William Rollinson Whittingham was the most remarkable personage, after John Henry Hobart, who has figured among the leaders and champions of the High Church party in the Protestant Episcopal Church. He was a typical High Churchman, in the foremost rank as a leader of his party, and therefore his biography is a document of great importance and

interest to his co-religionists, and to many others as well. Besides, his personal character and history were, in themselves, interesting. Mr. Brand has done his work faithfully and well. He has exhibited the personality and the public career of his subject as they really were; although, in some respects, his own sentiments and sympathies are certainly not in harmony with those of his former ecclesiastical chief and life-long friend. Moreover, he has observed a courtesy in speaking of persons and things which gave occasion for invidious remarks of his own, quite in consonance with what those who have known him personally would have beforehand expected; so that no one, Catholic or Protestant, can take offense at what he has written, unless, perhaps, he is one of a certain clique of domestic foes of the bishop in his own ecclesiastical household.

The life of Bishop Whittingham was included between the years 1805 and 1879, and his episcopate began in 1840, thus extending over the long term of forty years. He was just a little younger than Cardinal Newman and a little older than Cardinal Manning; so that his life fell within the period so momentous in the ecclesiastical history of England and the United States, in which these two eminent men were the most conspicuous leaders in a movement of critical import both for the Catholic Church and for the Church of England. He was of English parentage, and by education and sympathy a thorough Englishman. His mother, a most remarkable woman, of a deeply religious character and a thorough education seldom seen in a woman, educated her son by herself, in a strict seclusion and with a Spartan severity, teaching him Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and some modern languages, together with the usual English branches, literally from his infancy. At the age of seventeen he entered a clerical seminary in New York, and after ordination was engaged in parochial work and the labors of a professorship in the seminary where he was graduated, until his appointment to the position of bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Maryland. From childhood he was virtuous, pious after a very strict and even ascetic manner, and devoted to study with such a constant and excessive application that his health and constitution were seriously impaired; so that it is a wonder that he lived to the age of seventy-four. His life was secluded, and he was so shut up within the confines of Anglicanism that its stamp, as it were, pervaded and brought into a fixed, unchangeable form all the wax of his nature.

He was sensitive and affectionate in his temper, generous in his disposition, enthusiastic but also indefatigable and persevering in his undertakings, although it cannot be said that his career was a successful one. The history of his public life is a rather sad one,

full of records of illness, of wearisome struggles with the apathy and niggardliness of his flock, with the bitter and obstinate resistance of a portion of his clergy, with disappointments and untoward events of many kinds, and ending at last in a long, slow dissolution. All was not, however, cloudy and dark; for he was of a sunny and cheerful temper, not gloomy, morose or melancholy. His vigor and force of mind and will were superior to bodily ailments; his intellectual resources furnished him with continual enjoyments and a refuge from the cares of office; he made many friends, who showed their sympathy by more than words when he was in trouble, and the tender ministrations of devoted affection alleviated and soothed the sufferings of illness until the end. He had his turns of depression and despondency, when he would wish that he was a poor negro slave, or a servant in a religious house, rather than to be burdened with the responsibilities of his office. But his elastic spirit always rebounded from this depression, and during his long and wearisome periods of illness he was a model of patience and fortitude in suffering. To a certain extent he was successful in bringing his diocese into a more prosperous and flourishing condition than it had been before he took charge of it. He died, having won the respect of all classes as a sincere, conscientious and disinterested laborer for the religious and moral welfare of his fellow-men, and a patriotic lover of his country; and having gained a high reputation for learning and ability.

Bishop Whittingham may be taken as a representative High Churchman; the man best fitted to hold and defend the fortress of the Protestant Episcopate, so far as that is a tenable position. His history presents the controversy in a concrete, tangible shape, having his side of it personified in himself as a leader and champion whose success or failure is equivalent to the victory or defeat of his cause. He asserted his claim to be the one and only rightful Bishop of Maryland as against the title of the Archbishop of Baltimore, and against every other claim to pastoral rights under whatever name independent from his jurisdiction. His clergy and laity were the true church to which all the baptized inhabitants of the State owed allegiance, while all other ecclesiastical societies were mere congregations of schismatics, if not even heretics. He made a strenuous fight for his title, and had it engraved on his tombstone. His idea of the rights and powers belonging to his office as a bishop was, moreover, a very high one. The ancient axiom, *Ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia*, changed into *Ubi Episcopus ibi Ecclesia*, might serve as a summary of his whole doctrine. His particular location in the diocese of Maryland brought him and his High Church position face to face with Rome and her claim of supremacy. He was, as it were, domiciled under the shadow of the cathedral

of Baltimore, whose deep toned bell boomed forth daily in the hearing of all the city the call to come there as to Mother Church. There was the throne of the highest Roman prelate in the United States, the See from whose domain the bishoprics and afterwards the provinces were formed over which this venerable church of Baltimore enjoys a perpetual precedence of dignity, though not a canonical primacy.

The school of High Church divines in England, which had counted some illustrious names among its leaders, preserved the semi-Catholic tradition from the sixteenth century, and leavened with it, more or less, the Church of England; until, towards the middle of the present century, it put forth a new vigor at Oxford, creating an excitement which was felt in this country and attracted the attention of the world. Its adherents were called by outsiders "Tractarians," from the famous "Tracts for the Times," which culminated in Newman's "Ninetieth Tract," and also "Puseyites," from the most distinguished leader of the movement. They met with violent opposition, and by many of their enemies were accused of being disguised Romanizers; while others more moderate and impartial charged them with holding and teaching principles and doctrines virtually Roman, with a tendency towards Rome; which, if they became prevalent and dominant, must have the effect of unprotestantizing the Church of England, and undoing the work of Henry, Edward and Elizabeth.

When the young Professor Whittingham was proposed for the diocese of Maryland, in which long and obstinate contests had been kept up between the High and Low Church parties over the election of a bishop, the Oxford controversy was beginning to make a stir in New York, and the Maryland Episcopalians were most anxious to discover whether Mr. Whittingham was a Tractarian. He was called by that name afterwards, and accused of being, whether wittingly or unwittingly, a Crypto-Roman churchman. The fact is, that his convictions and sympathies were with the Oxford movement in its beginning, and so far as it was purely Anglican. He was of the school of Andrewes, Ken, the non-jurors, and Hobart. He admired the writings of Pusey, Newman, Keble, Williams, Palmer and others of the new school, and had a proclivity toward a catholicizing movement beyond the old-fashioned High Church position, which he might have followed but for certain rude shocks which threw him back on the Protestant prejudices of his education. Inclination toward Rome he had none; on the contrary, we have never known any Episcopalian clergyman, glorying in the name of Catholic, with such an intense and violent animosity against the Roman Church, except one; that is Bishop Coxe, who is not a reasonable man, but a phenomenon of

odium ecclesiasticum. We have heard him say that he would wish that Rome might be swallowed up by an earthquake. He regarded the whole Church under the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff as a vast and wicked schism, virtually heretical, and despoiled of the rights and privileges once possessed by the universal Church and all its portions. It was not merely that, as Anglicans have been used to assert, Roman prelates had invaded the territory in which bishops of the English Church and its colonies had prior and canonical possession, that he denounced them as schismatics. It was that they were not rightful and Catholic bishops anywhere, even where, as in Canada and Louisiana, they had prior possession. This was the full and fundamental plea for his claim to be the Bishop of Maryland, and for the claim of his sect to be, as he styled it in official documents, "The Holy Catholic Church, *known as the Protestant Episcopal Church* in the United States of America." It was on the basis of this assumption that he took an active part in organizing a little mission church in Mexico, to which a bishop was sent, an undertaking which, with all similar missionary expeditions into Catholic countries, his successor deprecated in the last General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Baltimore. It is only on this ground that the rulers of the Church of England can justify their establishment of bishops in Gibraltar, Quebec, Montreal and elsewhere, and planting their churches everywhere in Catholic countries and among Oriental Christians.

These anti-Roman views and sentiments only came out into their most explicit and emphatic expression gradually, and were not at first fully understood by those who either admired or distrusted Bishop Whittingham on account of his supposed sympathy with the Oxford *soi-disant* Catholic school of divines. In pursuance of this line of conduct toward the Church which he declared in the plenitude of his apostolic authority to be a schismatical and virtually heretical, even *idolatrous*, sect, he required of priests seeking admission into his communion a solemn abjuration, and re-confirmed lay persons who, in his phraseology, "returned to the Church from the Roman schism." "On one occasion, when a younger bishop vindicated himself for having called the Church of Rome 'infernal,' Bishop Whittingham said: 'There is one bishop in the house who is not afraid at any time or anywhere to profess his belief that the Lord has permitted Satan to have possession of that branch of his Church of which the Bishop of Rome is the head."[1] He announced to the Convention of 1872 the deposition of one of his clergy, who had become a Catholic, "from the holy ministry at his own request, on his surrender of himself

[1] *Life*, vol. ii., p. 141.

as a slave to the Roman usurper of lordship over the heritage of God."[1] Nevertheless, Mr. Brand asserts that "he had no wish to deny that the Church of Rome and other churches submissive to her form parts of the Church Catholic. Yet his judgment of the Roman Church was very severe, and he always justified it because of long familiarity with her perversions of Catholic teaching and close study of the result of her system in countries under her control, undisturbed by the influence of other religious bodies."[2]

Mr. Brand, to his credit, tries to draw it as mild as he can, being evidently much less anti-Roman than the subject of his biography. But he only shows the inconsistency of the bishop with himself and the great confusion of his ideas about the Catholic Church, caused by his hatred of Rome. Let us suppose the case of a French Huguenot or Jew, free from any supposed obligation of baptism and ordination in the Protestant Episcopal Church, seeking admission into that "part of the church catholic," which is in France. How would it sound to describe his reception into the church by the curé of one of the parishes of Paris in these terms: "A. B., having renounced the errors of the religion in which he had been educated, has been received into the Catholic Church of Christ by baptism in a schismatical and virtually heretical branch of the church under the dominion of the Roman Church, which is possessed by Satan, thus surrendering himself as a slave to the usurper of lordship over God's heritage." It is perfectly plain that the whole *animus* of Bishop Whittingham is the same with that of Cranmer, Jewell, Knox, Luther and Calvin. The Roman Church is, in all consistency, to be regarded as a fallen and apostate church; and, if there is any true church in western Christendom, it must be found among Protestants who have left the old and founded a new church, reformed according to the primitive model.

Bishop Whittingham, however, denied the character of a church to every Protestant body which had not preserved the apostolic succession of bishops. Not only this, but he denied the validity of baptism not administered by a duly ordained bishop, priest or deacon; thus cutting off from the flock of baptized Christians the whole multitude of non-episcopal Protestants, together with not a few of the clergy and laity of his own church. He was accustomed to re-baptize lay persons, and even presbyters. On one occasion he re-baptized a bishop-elect on the eve of his consecration.

From Bishop Whittingham's standpoint, western Christendom presents a sad spectacle indeed as a waste of schism and heresy,

---

[1] *Ibid.* [2] *Ibid.*

having only the Church of England with her affiliations standing in a truly Catholic position; while even within this communion only a minority, which, in the language of the non-jurors, might be called a "Catholic remnant," professed distinctively the High Church principles and doctrines ascribed to the "undivided church before the separation of east and west."

As for the so-called "Orthodox Eastern Church," measured by the Protestant standard, it is just the same in all essential respects as the Roman Church, *minus the papal supremacy;* and a severe judgment on the Roman Church for perversions of Catholic teaching, if it could be justified, would, with this exception, strike equally both Latins and Greeks as virtually heretical through having added to the faith false doctrines, and schismatical through making unauthorized terms of communion, and excluding from church fellowship the really pure churches which have reformed themselves after the genuine, primitive type.

Thus, the High Churchman, both in theory and in fact, finds himself confined, as to church fellowship, to a communion which holds an isolated position in Christendom, separated from all which he consents to call catholicism, and from all Protestant societies except his own. Surely this is an untenable and unbearable position on a narrow and slippery ledge. No wonder that, after finding efforts to obtain consolation from St. Petersburg and Constantinople vain, and being disappointed in the "Old Catholic" fiasco, bishops should seek for some brotherly sympathy in a Presbyterian synod, and long to see their Protestant brethren throng to the portal of the "historic episcopate."

Bishop Whittingham was a Protestant who did not merely and passively submit to a technical designation fastened on him by official acts and custom, but officiously, and without any compulsion, entitled his Baltimore magazine "The True Catholic, Reformed Protestant and Free."

But he also emphatically claimed and asserted for himself and his church the glorious title of Catholic. In what, then, did this catholicity consist? He believed in a visible institution, founded by Jesus Christ, for all times and places, with a definite creed, a hierarchy, sacraments and ordinances of divine appointment and perpetual obligation, and whose proper name is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church. Every doctrine denying or altering any article of the Catholic creed is heresy, separation from the Catholic Church is schism, and both are deadly sins. The hierarchy of the church was constituted chiefly in the Apostles, whose ordinary powers were transmitted by ordination to bishops, their successors in office, and, secondarily, in two inferior orders of presbyters and deacons, who received their ministerial character only

by episcopal ordination. He believed also in the sacerdotal character of the ministry, viz., as being "a human intervention for the remission of sins"; in sacramental grace; in the sacrificial nature of the Holy Eucharist, according to a certain sense; and in some kind of real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine. He acknowledged the dogmatic decrees of the first six councils, the doctrine and discipline of the early centuries, and the teaching of the Fathers, as containing a trustworthy witness to the faith and law received from the Apostles, and an authoritative interpretation of the inspired rule of faith and morals contained in the Scriptures.

This is the catholicism of a High Churchman in the abstract. So far as it is positive, it is in agreement with the concept which a Greek or a Latin theologian forms of objective catholicism. The difference is one of shortcoming and is negative. It does not give, in the concrete, a tenable position to Dr. Whittingham as Catholic Bishop of Maryland, and to his communion as the Catholic Church in the United States of America.

The High Church position is the position of a party standing on private opinions and not on official, authoritative confessions or formulas of faith. Bishop White, Dr. Turner, who was the principal professor in the New York Seminary for many years, and many other leading men, rejected that semi-catholic system which was taught by the Oxford divines. Some denounced it as a deadly heresy, another gospel. Official, ecclesiastical orthodoxy, in the Church of England and her American daughter, admits the low and broad churchmanship of a great number of the clergy and laity within its ample skirts. Bishop Whittingham was not required by canonical law to assume the attitude of a priest offering sacrifice on an altar, to style himself Bishop of Maryland, to give certificates that he conferred confirmation and orders according to the rite of the Catholic Church, to pronounce lay-baptism invalid, or to proclaim all Christian societies not in his communion schismatical sects. He was obliged to recognize bishops and presbyters of the Low Church party as having an ecclesiastical equality with those of his own party. When he had preached one of his famous sermons on the priesthood during morning service in Christ Church, Baltimore, on the occasion of his instituting the Rev. Mr. Johns as rector, he had to submit to the mortification of being flatly and vehemently contradicted by that gentleman in a sermon preached at the evening service.

Now, on the hypothesis that there was a pure Catholic Church, the legitimate heir and representative of the Church of the Fathers and the first six councils, existing in America, surrounded by sects and confronted by a great pseudo-catholic rival, that true Catholic Church ought to proclaim its character and title openly, ought to

teach distinctly the Catholic faith of the Fathers and condemn all contrary heresies, ought to show plainly its divine lineaments as the Church of God, so that it might be known of all men as the Holy Catholic Church. The fact that Bishop Whittingham's ecclesiastical connection was unknown as the Catholic Church, and "known as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," is enough to prove that he substituted an ideal creation of his own imagination, a cathedral in the air, for the more modest reality which old-fashioned Episcopalians have been wont to style "*This Church*" and "*Our Church.*"

But even this ideal church lacks some essential elements of unity and catholicity. Its complete, organic constitution is found in each particular diocese, no matter how small, where there is a bishop, with his clergy and laity. The collection of these single, independent churches, although spread over the whole world, cannot make one, catholic church, any more than America can be called one republic, or all the peoples of Aryan descent a universal Aryan nation. Besides, although all these churches, if they preserved intact one faith, one law, the same sacraments, the same discipline and unbroken fellowship with each other, would have a moral unity; yet, this merely episcopal constitution would not possess the requisites for the preservation of this common agreement, or have any adequate means of hindering the breaking up of Christianity into a multitude of hostile sects.

The confederation of dioceses in a particular country is evidently a merely human and voluntary association, according to this idea of the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, such an association is dignified with the titles which belong only to the Catholic Church. The Church of England, or the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, is regarded as the body into which one is incorporated by baptism; as the mother to whom allegiance is due; as having an authority in doctrine and discipline which must be obeyed. This is an absurdity. A visible church which is one and catholic must have unity and universality of organization, and to have authority it must have infallibility. Its unity must bind it together in all ages, its sanctity must preserve it from teaching error and commanding or permitting sin, its catholicity must give it extension in time and space as one whole, not as a multiplication of separate, similar units, its apostolicity must be a continuity of apostolic authority including the essential element of supreme and universal teaching, judging and governing power. It is impossible that a Catholic Church should possess these attributes without a head and a centre of unity. There must be One See, One Church, which is indefectibly and infallibly secured on the basis of unity, sanctity, catholicity and apostolicity; an immovable

centre in which resides supreme authority and the source of episcopal jurisdiction in all confederated churches; in order that they may be all one, parts of a whole, branches from one trunk and one root, a perfect society, an organic, living body, animated by one soul, having a perpetual, indestructible life. An apostolic succession in an episcopate is not complete, without the succession of the apostolate as it was originally constituted under one head and prince of the apostolic college. The Catholic Church as one church, one flock, one society of all the faithful, bishops, clergy and laity; must have one head, one shepherd, one supreme bishop, the universal doctor, judge, and ruler of all Christians, as the delegate and vicar of Jesus Christ, who is the High Priest and Apostle over the household of God. The only complete and perfect definition of the church is: the Catholic, Apostolic, *Roman* Church.

The Oxford movement, because it was catholic, necessarily led toward Rome, by the roads of history, logic and theology. Enemies and impartial observers saw this from the beginning, though the leaders and disciples of the movement did not see it. In those days, it was a far cry to Rome. A crowd of ardent, enthusiastic young men were fascinated by the idea of the Catholic Church, while they were repelled by the prejudices of education and Protestant tradition from the Roman supremacy and supposed Roman alterations of Catholic doctrines joined with additions of new doctrines, all embodied in the decrees of the Council of Trent, not acknowledged as œcumenical, because the Greek Church and the Church of England had no part in it. There was a vision before their eyes of the church of the Fathers, the church before the division of east and west. There was a natural and strong attachment to the Church of England in those who had been brought up in it, and a deep desire to vindicate its rights as a part of the church catholic and as essentially the same with the Church in England, as it existed from the time of St. Augustine to the time of Cranmer. There was a dream of the restoration of unity in Christendom, by an œcumenical council which should harmonize all differences between Latins, Greeks and Anglicans, effect a new and catholic reformation, draw in all Protestants, and inaugurate a new era for Christianity. In the meantime, all efforts should be made to catholicize the Church of England, and to promote amicable relations with the churches of the east, with the hope that western Catholics might gradually be inclined to look with a more favorable eye on the sister estranged and disowned, who was sitting apart in the cathedral of Canterbury and the colleges of Oxford. In America, a similar group of young men lent an eager ear to the Catholic chant which was taken up and repeated on this side of the Atlantic. For the same reasons which were operative in

England, those who were aroused and fascinated by the new Catholic war-cry, wished to remain in the Protestant Episcopal Church and yet be Catholics, with Catholic principles and holding Catholic doctrines. The Roman Church was foreign, alien and remote to them. English literature and English sympathies had determined their opinions and sentiments from childhood, and even if they had not been brought up in the Episcopal Church, these influences had brought them into its communion, as the home of their ancestors and congenial to their ideas and tastes. This group of Neo-Catholics was formed in New York, where Bishop Hobart had prepared the way, and particularly in and about the seminary, where Mr. Whittingham was a professor. He was still a young presbyter, but he was a very learned man, well fitted to attract his pupils and win their admiration and devotion, precisely the one to whom they would look as a leader and a guide. It would seem that he might have been for his pupils at the seminary and the young clergymen resorting there, and after he was made a bishop for the young clergymen whom he attracted around him in his diocese, such a leader as Newman was at Oxford. For a time, he appeared to hold such a position. One of his pupils, Arthur Carey, a youth of remarkable parts and character, was very far advanced, like Richard Hurrell Froude, on the way toward becoming fully and completely a Catholic, although both died prematurely, without having taken the last decisive step. Carey was subjected to a most rigorous examination before ordination, and although he was passed by the majority of the examiners and his bishop, who thereupon ordained him deacon, two presbyters publicly protested against the act and walked out of the church. An intense excitement and a lively polemical war followed this event. Bishop Whittingham ardently espoused the cause of Carey and was most anxious to draw him to his diocese. For some time, he was equally sympathetic with other young clergymen who had been drawn into the Oxford movement, and was looked up to by them with confidence and hope as one who would lead them in the way of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, and the others who were advancing on the Catholic road. It is well known how the party kept advancing, some going very near the gate of the Catholic Church and then pausing or receding, others going through, in many cases even to the Catholic priesthood, in a few, attaining the dignity of bishops and cardinals of the Holy Roman Church. If Bishop Whittingham did not recede, he at least ceased to advance; and he became more solicitous to check the Romeward movement, to defend himself from the danger of ecclesiastical censure, and to hinder ritualistic innovations, than to propagate those semi-Catholic doctrines for which he was so zealous in the begin-

ning. He stopped to entrench himself in the old High Church position. But it was impossible to persuade all who had embraced Catholic principles, and some Catholic doctrines to halt in the middle ground between pure Protestantism and authentic, consistent Catholicism. A great crowd in England, and a smaller number in America, went back to the old church which their forefathers had abandoned, either by a wilful apostasy, or a weak and listless yielding to force and fraud. They had been deluded for a time by the specious pretext of a Catholicity more Catholic, and an antiquity more ancient, and had striven to live or exercise the ministry as Catholics, until they found by experience that they had been deceived by an amateur catholicism, partially and grudgingly tolerated in a church which was essentially and unalterably Protestant.

Some of the converts had been numbered among the clergy or the disciples of Bishop Whittingham, who naturally felt their loss very keenly, and also feared that his own position was compromised in the opinion of the public, as having maintained the premises from which they had drawn the logical conclusion. This may explain the violence of his language, some specimens of which disfigure the pages of Mr. Brand's biography. Of course, the biographer is merely narrating and need not be supposed to approve the damnatory sentences fulminated against the Roman Pontiff and those who preferred to submit to his authority than to the private opinions of Bishop Whittingham. Mr. Brand, however, in his own person, although usually mindful of the canons of propriety and good taste, sometimes lapses into a dialect which we must be excused for calling *vulgar*, using such terms as "Romish" and "papist." On the other hand, in relating one instance of conversion, he writes: "suddenly he announced that he was *a Catholic*." i., 435. We do not impute any personal resentment or bitterness to Bishop Whittingham. We think he was sincere and conscientious in his convictions about the Roman Church, and was therefore compelled by consistency with these convictions, to regard converts as worthy of severe censure. He had a sort of puritanical spice in his religious constitution, which made it impossible for him to preserve respect and personal friendship for Newman, Ives, Baker, and others whom he regarded as deserters. Therefore, there was no course open for those who had been his personal friends, except to abstain from all further intercourse with him. Dr. Pusey, Bishop Doane and other Protestant clergymen have taken a different attitude. But we do not think that any converts who have been Bishop Whittingham's personal friends, and to whom he had been formerly kind, have ever cherished any other than amicable sentiments towards him, or been

disposed to make a harsh judgment of the motives by which he was governed in his polemical course against the Church which they revere and love as the Church of God. At least, we can answer for ourselves.

Of course, Mr. Brand, regarding conversions to the Catholic Church as "perversions to Romanism," and being obliged to mention some of them in his narrative, had to say something of the causes which led to them; to account in some way for the fact that the "catholicity more catholic" than Roman Catholicity lost its hold on some minds and hearts.

Feeling that he was skating on thin ice, he has glided over it as quickly and lightly as possible. Let him speak for himself, and every one will see that he is mild and courteous, and also very weak.

"The position of Bishop Whittingham as a churchman, which made him to be suspected and opposed by evangelicals in his diocese and out of his diocese, made him an attraction to those who, with him, had been trained in the school of Hobart, or who had felt the influence of the Oxford movement. In the earlier half of his episcopate, high-churchmen sought employment in Maryland, and were content to make sacrifices for the support of sympathy. Especially the young, whether from abroad or Marylanders, gathered around the bishop and had their enthusiasm for catholic truth kindled by his zeal. Is it a matter of surprise that what he helped to kindle he could not always temper? That in Maryland as elsewhere, zealots for Catholicism chilled by necessary contact with Protestantism, listened to the claims of Rome and persuaded themselves that the escape from all that had been felt as a hindrance was to be found in a system, which promises peace in return for entire self-abnegation? . . . .

"What is it that leads men to the abandonment of our church for that of Rome? So far as my experience reaches, it is a desire for what, in worship and mode of teaching, is believed by them to be our catholic inheritance, because seen to belong to ages which we designate as primitive and claim to be our model. That is, it is not a doubt as to their rights, but a feeling that they can, elsewhere better enjoy their rights. . . . .

"Mr. Baker's reasons, as given to his quondam bishop, however moving to himself, seem very inoperative; sentiment is not communicable by way of argument. More than one friend has been converted by a dream; how can one oppose such a motive? From the church men have turned to Quakerism, as to a system better suited to their spiritual needs; others have become Irvingites, or Swedenborgians. The bias of a man's mind inclines him to one error or its opposite. The papal system is not a thing of

chance. On a true foundation it was built up by men, and therefore men of like mind find in this seeming temple of God what is suited to their nature. With a show of the supernatural, it is especially rational. And as men found it to meet the demands of reasoning, so men are ready to accept it who cannot face a doubt or difficulty which is unremoved by God."[1]

To say that the Catholic system is especially rational is to give it high praise. Also, that it corresponds to the demands of human nature. If the whole Catholic theology has been framed to meet the demands of reasoning, it would seem that those who have embraced it for that very purpose, because they were unwilling to face doubts, in the sense of adhering to a system which appeared to them incapable of removing those doubts, must have had some reasons to adduce for themselves, besides dreams and sentimental considerations. And Mr. Brand's way of eluding the difficulty in his path is manifestly trivial when we reflect on the whole library of books which have been published by Roman, German, English and American converts, in the entire Catholic controversy, in this last fifty years; to say nothing of those produced in earlier times by Bessarion, Leo Allatius, Campion and others, and the voluminous works of writers who were not converts, from Bellarmine to Wiseman. It is undoubtedly true that Catholics, Anglicans and members of various Protestant churches have wandered away into all kinds of strange sects, and that this mere fact proves nothing either for or against any particular system of religious belief. But, although this is perfectly true, it is perfectly irrelevant to the case in hand. Essential intellectual changes in the convictions and beliefs of educated and serious men are produced by the abandonment of principles which they formerly held. No one ever adopted the heliocentric theory by following out the geocentric theory to its conclusions; and vice versa, no one could be led into the abandonment of the Copernican system for the Ptolemaic by following up the principles of Copernicus, Galileo, Newton and later astronomers. Many intelligent, educated, and pious men, who loved the Church of England and were held in it by many and powerful motives, having imbibed Catholic principles and embraced Catholic doctrines through the study of Anglican divines and of the fathers, by the force of these teachings, the maturing of their convictions and the effect of earnest efforts to live up to this belief, have advanced steadily, often very gradually, to the firm conclusion that genuine and complete catholicism is only to be found in the Roman Church. They have been men of very different temperaments, of various professions and in dissimilar

[1] *Ibid*, p. 434, etc.

environments, following distinct roads among the many which lead toward Rome and find there their point of convergence. Some have made sacrifices, even severe ones, in obedience to the voice of conscience. It is impossible to do away with the force of the practical evidence furnished by the number and quality of the conversions of the last half century that they were the legitimate, logical, and moral result of the Oxford movement. Such is the judgment of all observers of the rise and progress of this movement in the surrounding world, except those who belong to the small party of high-churchmen.

The truth is, that instead of reasons being required why one who believes in the One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church should join the communion of the Roman Church, reasons, and very decisive ones, are requisite in order to convince such an one that he can reasonably and safely remain out of it, and *a fortiori* that it is his *duty* to leave it, or to abstain from joining it.

The process of conversion, for one who has imbibed catholic principles and high-church doctrines, is one by which obstacles and impediments are removed, the mind freed from prejudices and misapprehensions, and a true idea is gained of the ancient, the mediæval, and the modern Catholic Church. When this change of perspective and clearing of the atmosphere from mist has taken place, one either bravely follows his conscience and passes through the gate which admits him into the temple of God, or he hesitates and begins to look about for an excuse to remain outside. Very often he makes a retrogade movement, and having seen where his catholic principles logically and consistently lead, falls back upon Protestantism, or even Rationalism.

Mr. Brand evidently has no idea of the Catholic position of St. Cyprian, St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Bernard, and all the fathers, in contradistinction from the position of ancient and modern Protestants. What is this position and its advantages? It is briefly this, that God had made the *Ecclesia Docens* an infallible teacher and judge in faith and morals for all places and times. The advantage is that it gives to all men a certain and easy proximate rule of faith and a sure guide in the way of salvation. There is only one question to be answered, for one who believes in the divinity of Christ and His religion. What is the proximate rule of faith? If that question is answered in the Catholic sense, he has only to believe and obey what the Catholic Church teaches and commands. If, in the Protestant sense, he must find out for himself as best he can, what the Bible teaches. The middle position of semi-Catholic Anglicans does not relieve him from this difficult task. It offers him the ancient Christian tradition as a guide and aid in ascertaining the true sense of the

Scriptures. But this only doubles his task. For he must ascertain for himself what is the genuine, authentic Catholic tradition, amid all the controversies of Latins, Greeks, Anglicans and various kinds of Protestants.

It is like walking a slack rope stretched between two high towers, to attempt to be a Catholic after the manner of Mr. Brand and Bishop Whittingham. Practically the rule of Bishop Whittingham amounted to this: "Obey the Catholic Church, known as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and personified in me, the Bishop of Maryland." This is, indeed, an intolerable servitude. Whereas, to obey the Bishop of the Catholic Church, the successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Christ, the rightful and unerring spokesman of Catholic tradition, of all the œcumenical councils, and of the *Ecclesia Docens*, infallible in all its ordinary as well as its solemn teaching of the doctrine of faith and morals, is a most reasonable service, worthy of the most intelligent and learned, as well as of the most simple and untaught Christians.

A catholic spirit cannot begin to stir in a religious community which is isolated from all the rest of Christendom, without awakening a restless desire to escape from this isolation. It is not enough to seek communion by reading with the historical church of the early ages, or to dream of a reunited church of the future. The longing for some present actual fellowship with Christians of other countries is irrepressible. Naturally the Episcopalian high-churchman with catholic tendencies turned toward St. Petersburg and Constantinople, toward Syria and Greece, with the hope of gaining some sympathy and recognition from Episcopal churches, separated like themselves, from the communion of Rome.

One of these experiments was the mission of Bishop Southgate to Constantinople. The plan was to establish the bishop with a presbyter and a deacon, who should engage to remain single, in a residence containing a chapel, where divine service should be celebrated with as much ceremony as the rites and customs of the Episcopal Church admit, and where carefully-prepared sermons would be preached, in the hope of attracting the native clergy to attend these services. A theological school was to be opened for the young ecclesiastics and a press put in operation for circulating tracts composed of extracts from the Greek Fathers and translations from Anglican divines, or original compositions of the gentlemen of the mission. The object aimed at was the cultivation of such relations with the Oriental clergy that they might be brought to recognize the orders and the orthodoxy of the Episcopal Church and also to receive a mild dose of Protestantism for the improvement of their own orthodoxy. There was one fatal blunder com-

mitted at the outset which was sufficient by itself to ruin the whole scheme. Instead of placing an unmarried clergyman in the Episcopal chair and leaving Mr. Southgate, who was a married man, to the secondary place of a presbyter, Mr. Southgate was consecrated —a measure abhorrent to all Orientals—and celibacy was imposed on his clergy, which is not considered as necessary in the Greek rite. The enterprise proved to be a *fiasco;* Bishop Southgate returned to America to become a parish rector, and his son is now a devoted, self-denying, hard-working Catholic priest in the diocese of Baltimore.

We had the honor to be selected by Bishop Southgate as his deacon, on the recommendation of Bishop Whittingham, though the appointment was not confirmed by the Missionary Committee. While we were in New York making preparations for the expected voyage, we called on Dr. Seabury, who questioned us closely as to the methods we intended to follow in our efforts to bring about intercommunion with the Orientals.

"Do you intend to persuade the Greeks to modify any of their doctrines and practices?" "I suppose we must do so." "What are they?" "Chiefly, I should think, the invocation of the Virgin and the saints, and the veneration of images." "But all their doctrines and practices on this head are sanctioned by the second Council of Nice, which they receive as the seventh Œcumenical Council." "That is not an Œcumenical Council." "There is just as much reason to call the seventh council Œcumenical as any of the first six. What reason can you give for rejecting it?"

If the Greek and Anglican Churches could be united one would have to conform itself to the other. The Greeks will never come down to the level of Anglicanism. Will the Church of England come up to the Greek level? Will she receive the seventh Council? The eighth Council stands on the same solid ground with the seventh. It is a significant fact that the Greek Church canonizes the Patriarch Ignatius, but has never thought of paying honor to Photius or Michael Cerularius, the authors of her schismatical rebellion against the See of Peter. The Councils of Lyons and of Florence have all the œcumenical characters which a Greek or an Anglican can demand. There is no standing-place, no halting-place where one can take his position and say: "Up to this point the Church was infallible, and held councils which were œcumenical and infallible; but afterwards this supreme authority was lost or suspended." This is a surrender to Eutyches, Nestorius, and Arius. Their case is as good as that of Photius, Cranmer, and Laud. It is absurd to suppose that a certain number of bishops, by falling away from the unity of the Church, can deprive her

councils of the prerogatives of a supreme tribunal. From Chalcedon to Florence, Trent, and the Vatican, the king's highway is straight and solid. The first and the last of the Œcumenical Councils are indissolubly bound together. Either both must be accepted or both rejected. For one who takes the latter alternative and still wishes to remain a Christian, there is no refuge except the dreary waste of Protestantism—the Protestantism of Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, John Calvin and Martin Luther.

Every one who holds to the principle of the hierarchical organization of the Catholic Church must deplore the separation of the Greeks and Protestants from the communion of the Roman Church as a great disaster, and desire the restoration of unity in Christendom. Not only so; but all those who profess to believe in the divinity of Christ and in Christianity as a supernatural religion, must deplore the divisions and dissensions which alienate professing Christians from each other. There is a great cry from all quarters for unity among Christians. But what are the prospects of this dream being realized and what the principles and methods by which such a unifying process can be even commenced?

Is this general union to include or to exclude the Roman Church? If the former alternative is taken, is there any one so credulous as to suppose that the Roman Church will ever abjure those Councils, from the fourth of Constantinople to the Vatican, in which her supremacy has been affirmed and vindicated against all who have raised the standard of revolt against her in the east and in the west? There is but one way of reconciliation with Rome: to heed the invitation given by Pius IX. when he convoked the Council of the Vatican, and undo the sad work of the Photian schism and the Protestant revolution.

If Rome is to be left out in the scheme of reunion, is there any one who imagines that all Protestants can be brought to seek reconciliation with the Patriarch of Constantinople on his own terms, or that he can be induced to reconcile himself with the Archbishop of Canterbury on an Anglican level? Can any sane person be credulous enough to expect that the Protestant Episcopal Church will absorb all the great denominations in the United States, or the Church of England annex the Presbyterian churches in Scotland? The Protestants on the Continent of Europe, are they going to sue humbly for orders to so-called bishops of the apostolical succession, whose ordination is not acknowledged by either Latin or Greek bishops?

Or, perhaps, is there to be an amicable agreement to drop all doctrinal and disciplinary questions of difference, and live in harmony, in perfect freedom of belief and practice?

Of late years the Oxford, or High-Church, movement has as-

sumed various phases and given rise to many divergent views and opinions. A considerable number of its adherents have approximated toward the Roman Church, not only in their ritualism, but also in doctrine, in respect for the Holy See, and in a desire for a corporate reunion of the Church of England with Rome. One very strange and peculiar set of men among them have struck out a new path which would have brought upon their heads the most vehement anathemas from Bishop Whittingham if he had lived to witness their procedure.

Abandoning the old line of a most strenuous defence of the validity of Anglican orders, they have given up all reliance in orders and even baptism in the Church of England as doubtful and untrustworthy. They have sought a rehabilitation by resorting to the bishops of the little sect of *Oud-Katholiken*, in Holland, for a conditional reiteration of baptism, confirmation, and ordination, a few having even received Episcopal consecration. They have thus set up a little *church* within a church, freely imparting to all seekers what they have themselves received. We have been credibly informed that Dr. Mossman was one of their bishops, and was received into the Church by Cardinal Manning, on his deathbed. How this step can make any essential change in their relations to the Catholic Church, we are at a loss to imagine. It is not the invalidity of orders which is the matter of chief moment and the principal ground for excluding the Church of England from Catholic communion; it is the heresy and schism, which remain the same, and are equally destructive of the vital principle of ecclesiastical unity in societies governed by a validly-ordained clergy as in those which have lost the succession. The Novatians, Donatists, Arians, Nestorians, and Monophysites had valid orders, yet were completely cut off from the Catholic Church. Their bishops had to be reconciled, and to be formally received as aliens; and it is the same now with those who belong to the Eastern sects. All efforts to effect a union or construct a unity by human plans are doomed to failure. The Lord has built his Church, once for all, on the Rock of Peter. All schism has begun by rebellion against the supreme authority of the successor of St. Peter, and all heresy by departing from his doctrines. There is no cure for these great evils except a return to his obedience.

Nevertheless, we do not wish to speak with disdain of the yearnings and aspirations after Christian unity which have been stirring the hearts of the nobler and more magnanimous of the estranged children of the Catholic Church, who have been separated from her communion by the crime of their ancestors.

It was a fearful and disastrous calamity which separated so many flourishing provinces of the Eastern patriarchates, between

the fifth and eleventh centuries, from the Apostolic See of St. Peter. It was a similar calamity which befel the immediate Western Patriarchate of the Pope during the sixteenth century. This religious cataclysm has made a wide chasm which it is difficult to cross over or to fill up, and which has been yawning for centuries. That Russia and England should return to the communion of the Holy See would seem to be, like the conversion of the Jews and Mohammedans to Christianity, hopeless; unless we could look up to a power which can accomplish what is humanly impossible.

If we hope that this most desirable gathering of all baptized Christians into one fold, under one Shepherd, is in the designs of Divine Providence, we must regard even the vague and visionary anticipations of union among Christians, but, especially all longings for a unity whose centre will be Rome, as encouraging signs of a future reconciliation and remote predispositions for this desirable result.

Among the more enlightened Orientals these signs have appeared in the past, as well as in more recent times. The Greeks have never had any idea of a unity embracing East and West, in which Rome is not the centre, and have always acknowledged a primacy, at least, *de jure ecclesiastico*, in the Roman Pontiff. The Emperor Alexander I., of Russia, was planning a reunion of the Russian Church with the Holy See, when a premature death ended his reign; and he received the last sacraments from a Catholic priest. Many of the principal clergy and laity of the Russian Church have Roman tendencies; some Greek bishops kissed the letters of invitation to the Vatican Council with tears of devotion, and all over the East there are signs of a desire to return to unity stirring the ignorance and apathy into which those oppressed and unhappy peoples have sunk.

In Germany, not to speak of illustrious converts like Hurter and Stolberg,—Leibnitz, Leo, and others have led the way in an approach toward Catholicism. In our own country, Dr. Leonard Woods, Jr., and some associates of his have made a similar approach. There has been a general and remarkable increase of candor and liberality of views and sentiments, an increase of the historical spirit and of sympathy with historical christianity, which we recognize with pleasure. The spirit of bitter and violent animosity against Rome still survives in religious and political factions and makes occasional demonstrations. But it is far less universal and dominant than it has been in former times. Among High Churchmen that view of the Catholic Church which represents it as existing in three great branches which are essentially one, has modified that sectarian opposition to the Roman Church which we

have seen so strongly exhibited in Bishop Whittingham; and has opened the way to a recognition of the claims of Rome on the gratitude and veneration of all Christians. Those Protestants who occupy a lower and broader ground have very generally enlarged their views of Christianity and the Church, so as to include all the divisions of professed believers in Christ who are sincere and upright. Canon Farrar, preaching in Trinity Church, New York, put entirely aside the notion that the Protestant Episcopal Church is the Church of America. The American Church, according to him, includes Catholics and the various kinds of Protestants. The narrow, sectarian notion that the Episcopal Church, or the Presbyterian Church, or any sectarian denomination, is the only true Church of Christ, is one that can never more gain a foothold. There is a universal demand among those who retain more or less of Christian belief, and who do not possess the original and genuine idea of the Catholic Church, for some kind of all-embracing Christianity which presents a plausible appearance of catholicism. The sects and confessions which are the offspring of the Lutheran revolution are breaking up, and definite doctrinal systems are evaporating. There is, moreover, a circumambient sea of rationalism, skepticism, agnosticism, invading all the coast-line of Christianity. The great Protestant denominations, and the large number of able and learned men whom they have produced, have formed a strong and serviceable breakwater against this incoming tide. To a certain extent, this is still the case. Nevertheless, by the irresistible logic of facts, and by the working of the law of evolution, the revolt of Luther against the authority of the Church must go on in its destructive course so long as its principles remain a living, active force.

All those who revere the name and the religion of Jesus Christ must admit that there is much which is sad and dark in the present aspect and the immediate prospects of Christendom. When we consider the great outlying world, which is not Christian, what probability can we see that any means at present employed for the conversion of this great majority of the human race can have any greater success in the near future, than they have had during the centuries which have elapsed since Christendom attained its present limits? Every Christian must believe that a regeneration of Christendom, and a conquest of Christianity over Judaism, Mohammedanism and Heathendom is possible with God if he chooses to put forth again that same almighty power by which he brought the Roman Empire under its benign sway. Every one must hope that he will do it. At the same time it is impossible to question the fact that division, disunion and civil war among the great bodies of professed Christians is the most serious obstacle in the

way of the practical influence of the Christian religion upon the mass of nominal Christians, and in the way of the triumph of the Gospel in the world at large. It is evident how much the power of religion would be augmented, in our own country, if all those who have some Christian belief and some practical Christian principles of life were united, and all the intelligence, learning, zeal and wealth to be found among them were concentrated upon efforts to promote the spiritual and moral welfare of their countrymen and of their fellow-men. If this unity were universal in Christendom, we might hope to see the nations which are nominally Christian become really Christian, so that of each one it might be said with truth, *Beatus populus cujus Dominus Deus est.* Missions to the heathen would present a different front, and make a far greater impression, if all missionaries taught one and the same doctrine and labored in harmony under one direction.

One fact is plain and palpable. It was apostolic Christianity which gained the first triumphs in the Roman Empire, and historical Christianity which gained the triumphs which followed. The same Christianity which triumphed in the beginning is the only power which can complete the victory of the religion of Christ in the end. The one all-important question to be decided is, therefore, what is the genuine apostolic and historical Christianity? In and through this alone is Catholic unity possible.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

LATIN HYMNS AND ENGLISH VERSIONS.

Dies Iræ; The Great Dirge of Thomas de Celano; Latin Text with a Strict Prose Translation; and Three New Versions in Rhyme; With a Brief Account of the Hymn. By Melancthon Woolsey Stryker. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York and Chicago. 1893.

THIS latest addition to the literature of hymnology is mentioned here not for the purpose of review, but as a convenient text for some observations on the subject of Latin hymnody and for some critical remarks and suggestions in the matter of the translation of Latin hymns. The text will serve this double purpose. For the *Dies Iræ*, although by universal consent the monumental Christian poem, may well stand as the embodiment of the prevailing spirit of Latin hymnody—filled as it is with the spirit of faith, of hope, of love; and mingling tears with trustfulness, penitence with the hope of pardon. Besides this, it has the unique honor amongst all hymns, of having exercised the genius of the most accomplished poets and versifiers in the attempt to present it fairly in the vernacular, and of having signally baffled, with a sphinx-like grandeur, the endless questionings into its secret power. Up to the present time, America alone has furnished one hundred recognized versions; while those which, hiding in the safe retreat of the desk, or emerging from it only to be lost in the obscurity of a local newspaper, have eluded the vigilance of the census-taker, would doubtless raise the total of translations to a much higher figure. Certainly, no other hymn has been rendered so many times into the vernacular; and it is fair to assume that the versions which have gained recognition were the best of their kind. This double fact is instructive; for the larger the number of versions, and the greater the talent and industry expended on them, the more patent becomes the difficulty, nay, the impossibility of preserving in any one translation the many charms of the original—the stateliness of its measure, its simple sublimity, its intense pathos, its lyric sweetness, the solemn blending of its tears and prayers, its sad forebodings and its tender confidence. In the sum of these peculiarities, indeed, the grand old hymn stands alone. Nevertheless, as it contains many discernible elements of the difficulty just alluded to, and shares them with all Latin hymns, it may serve as a type of the obstacles encountered by translators of the Church hymns, and as a text for some suggestions on this subject.

The history of our polyglot hymnology opens up to our eager gaze the long vista of Christian song commencing with the *Magnificat anima mea Dominum*—worthiest and most prophetic of texts for the grand choral praise of the centuries!—a vista which constantly widened and deepened as the succeeding years heard, first the flexible tongue of the Greek, then the deep-breathing voice of the Syrian, anon the musical cadences of the Latin, again the fresh vigor of the Celt, the broken accents of early English, the heavy tones of the Old German, the rich melody of the Italian, the energy of the Bohemian. Thus up to the sixteenth century. Discovery, colonization, and missionary enterprise gave a new burden to the songs of the remotest peoples of America and Asia; and these, together with Africa in our own day, have added new strength and wider channels to the full tide of song.

It does not belong to the scope of this paper to discuss at any length the history of hymnology; to point to the gradual growth and ecclesiastical recognition of the "Thesaurus Hymnologicus," the commentaries and expositions that grew up around it, the critical labors of such names—illustrious in this branch of study—as Clichtove, Massorillo, Cassander, George Fabricius, of the sixteenth century. With these names the work of exposition did not commence, indeed, but became of greatest value to subsequent investigators. Long before this era the work of exposition had begun. The ancient Irish Church had its "Liber Hymnorum" with explanatory comment on all the hymns. In the British Museum there is an English hymn-book of the eleventh century in which the hymns are printed with interlinear paraphrase; and another of the same century which simply indicates the hymns, but furnishes besides a consecutive prose version. Such expositions, quite common before the invention of printing, became afterwards very widely used. The sixteenth century, however, witnessed the birth of the great movement in critical and exegetical hymnology which, in the varying religious beliefs of its *personnel*, became the type of a similar literary activity in our own day.

Between these two epochs very little in the way of translation was accomplished that needs mention here. The first versions into English are to be found, says Rev. Prof. Thompson, in the "Primer" of 1545, a book of private devotions. Mr. Orby Shipley has gathered in his "Annus Sanctus" a number of the earlier English versions. A few translations are associated with illustrious names in the same period of relative inactivity—Dryden, Crashaw, and Lord Roscommon; while a partial paraphrase of the *Dies Iræ* in the "Lay of the Last Minstrel," brought Sir Walter Scott's name into connection with the subject

of hymnology. The beginning of the latter-day revival in this study was associated with, if not caused by (as Dr. Thompson would have us believe) the Oxford movement in the Anglican communion. It has been asserted that in Germany a similar impulse was communicated by the Romanticist fraternity of *littérateurs*. Whatever may have been the cause, it seems to have been a general one, at least in England. Speaking of the religious revival, John Henry Newman wrote, in vindication of his famous Tract No. XC: "I always have contended, and will contend, that it is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals upon a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it for many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways, and with essential differences one from another and perhaps from any church system, still all bear witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving toward something, and most unhappily, the one religious communion which has of late years been practically in possession of that something, is the Church of Rome."[1] He builded better than he knew. The "Church of Rome" could furnish, from her magnificent treasury of hymns, one part of that "something"—that *everything*—which she possessed, and which the world hungered for. And so the names of Isaac Williams, Rev. John Chandler, Bishop Mant, Rev. Edward Caswall, Dr. Newman, John Mason Neale swelled the list of translators of Latin hymns which of late years has become well-nigh endless.

With the first volume of his "Thesaurus Hymnologicus," published in 1841, Hermann Adelbert Daniel, one of the masters in the Pædagogium at Halle, may be considered as opening the brilliant chapter of the last fifty years of work in the field of critical and general hymnology. The first volume was devoted to Latin hymns. Vol. II. appeared in 1843, containing a large number of *Sequences*. In 1855 appeared Vols. IV. and V., as supplements to the first two volumes. In 1853 Mone's "Latin Hymns of the Middle Ages" (Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters) was published in three volumes—a work which supplied Daniel with much of the matter of his two last volumes. Daniel's work labors under many drawbacks from poor arrangement and confused indexing, but is still considered as invaluable in several respects.

In hastening to speak of this latter epoch, we must not overlook the great labors of Cardinal Bona, Muratori, Cardinal Thomasius who had already brought to light many rare and valuable texts, and discussed with great skill the vexing questions of au-

[1] Quoted in Duffield's *Latin Hymns*, p. 412.

thorship; Mart. Gerbert in his "Scriptores Ecclesiastici de Musica Sacra," a product of unwearied research; Faustino Arevalo in his "Hymnodia Hispanica"; Rambach in his "Anthologie"; Björn, who took account of the earliest hymns; Follen, of "Hymns of the Later Middle Ages, or by the Jesuits"; Mohnike, in his "Studies and Expositions"; Hoffmann von Fallersleben, in his treatise on the history of German hymns up to Luther's time; and many others. In 1844, Migne's "Patrologiæ Cursus Completus" was published in Paris. It is an endless storehouse of Christian poetry. But the gleaning goes on still, and the diligent and painstaking Ruth may find many an ear of unharvested wheat in the wide fields of hymnology. And surely the last fifty years have witnessed the most wonderful activity in the domains of general and special hymnology. As a distinct epoch it stands unrivalled for the number of its collections and treatises, and the scholarship and patient research of its devotees to church-song. A careful bibliography of its triumphs would fill many of these pages. It would include the names—famous, many of them, in other lines of thought—of Wackerbarth, Du Meril, Simrock, Königsfeld, Trench, Caswall, D. Ozanam, Schlosser, Neale, Gautier, Shipley, Wackernagel, Koch, Duffield, Kehrein, March, Kayser, Weale and Julian. This study has opened up and eagerly pursued every avenue of research, and has expressed itself in every literary form. It has been historical, biographical, classical, curious and critical. It has found a willing clientèle amongst churchmen and laymen, humanists and professional men. It has produced *brochures* and many-tomed works. The original hymns written in the vernaculars in the same period have been nearly endless. It has been estimated that the number of original hymns and translations existing at present in the various languages and dialects cannot fall far short of 400,000—an *embarras de richesse!* And yet, despite the large and constantly increasing literature that surrounds the subject, it has, perhaps, seemed to the casual observer to imply a very special and recondite erudition, and to be the gratification rather of an antiquarian than a utilitarian impulse. But granting something of truth to this estimate, still we cannot fairly deny the great good which has resulted from the study in an historical and literary, and even a devotional point of view.

Now, while this extraordinary movement has been concerned as well with the history of hymns in the vernacular as of those in the classic tongues, and while its *personnel* has been very notably, indeed, preponderatingly, Protestant, it must be deemed worthy of special note that the greatest amount of attention and sympathetic care has been expended on the elucidation of Latin hymns, on the verification of the minutest details of their history, and in criti-

cal discussions of their authorship. The activity has not, however, been wholly antiquarian in character. The hymns have been translated many times, and have found their way into the public religious services of the various Protestant sects. The most dogmatic of Catholic hymns, *e.g.*, those in the office of the Blessed Sacrament, have been altered in tone, and have found a prominent place where we should scarce expect to find any, even the remotest flavor of "Romanism." One author, indeed (Chancellor Benedict, in The Hymn of Hildebert, etc.), has translated the "Lauda Sion," that collection of dogmatic theses, with scrupulous literalness, and in apology therefor has attempted to wrest the one characteristic spirit of the text from its evident literalness into a "spiritual sense." Speaking of St. Thomas, he says: "It is but just to say that he doubtless intended that his words should be understood, according to the faith which the Roman Catholic Church now teaches; but it may also be said that the hymn might have been written by a Protestant, in the same words, without doing violence to the faith of the Protestant Church, although it does not fully express that faith; and I have preferred to translate it in that sense."

To what shall we ascribe this surpassing attraction of our hymns for such hearts and such intellects? The answer is to be found in a comparison between the hymns of the Church and those of the sects. Such a comparison would show us how much more fully the former satisfy all the essential requirements of a "hymn" than do the latter; and why, therefore, they should be sealed above their fellows with the seal of fairest worth and of perpetual youth. Any elaborate comparison between the two repertories, Catholic and Protestant, would not only be odious but tedious. And, besides, it would be as easy as it would be unfair to place side by side, for the sake of emphasis, the poorer amongst the vernacular hymns with the better amongst the Latin hymns. But if we were to compare the worst selections from both, it would be hard not to award the palm of lesser demerit to the Latin. However unclassical, unrhymthical; however rude in phrase and inartistic in form, the hymns which are given only in title in hymnologic collections, were at least prompted by the same deep, clear, dogmatic faith which, in its most poetic expression, became the monumental "Hymns of the Ages." They have, besides, the extrinsic charm of an unknown authorship. They were the unheard cries of some devout soul whose moment of "sensible" devotion found commemoration in the lonely and untoilsome verses that minted the rough ore of his after-thoughts. He builded not for the culture of this "age of progress," not even for his own age of piety, but for himself alone, or at most for the little fraternity of some mon-

astery of the wilderness. The vanity was a poor one which could have moved him to such a task! But in our day the glamour of publicity might easily prompt to the composition of hymns. And this may be one of the reasons why the endless catalogue of modern hymns should present to the devout hymnodist an embarrassment quite other than that of wealth.

So much for the poorest of the Latin hymns. But if we compare the best of them with the best of the vernacular hymns, we need not rely on the testimony of Catholic piety or prejudice for the award of highest merit. Protestants of all shades of religious opinion have given both direct and indirect praise of the highest kind to the grand songs of mediæval Catholicity. The title of the book placed at the head of this article is the latest contribution to the indirect praise. In the case of a literary work not only imitation, but translation, as well, is the sincerest flattery. The *Dies Iræ*, the *Stabat Mater*, the Eucharistic Hymns of the Angelic Doctor, the *Jesu dulcis memoria* and *Salve Caput Cruentatum* of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, the *Laus Patriae Coelestis* of Bernard of Cluny, have become famous merely in translation. Those who can appreciate the rhythmic pulses, the intense pathos, the honeyed sweetness of the originals, find a theme of admiration and a certain ecstatic praise which, coming from Protestant sources, must be considered a direct testimony of the greatest weight. The *Dies Iræ* has the most prominent place in this chorus of approbation. Daniel calls it: *sacrae poëseos summum decus et Ecclesiae Latinae Keimelion pretiossissimum.* Dr. Coles, who has translated it some sixteen or seventeen times, says: "Among gems it is the diamond. It is solitary in its excellence. Of Latin hymns it is the best known and the acknowledged masterpiece." Dr. Schaff in "Christ in Song," says: "This marvellous hymn is the acknowledged masterpiece of Latin poetry, and the most sublime of all uninspired hymns." Says Trench in "Sacred Latin Poetry:" "The metre so grandly devised, of which I remember no other example, fitted though it has here shown itself for bringing out some of the noblest powers of the Latin language, the solemn effect of the triple rhyme, which has been likened to blow following blow of the hammer on the anvil, the confidence of the poet in the universal interest of his theme, a confidence which has made him set out his matter with so majestic and unadorned a plainness as at once to be intelligible to all,—these merits, with many more, have given the *Dies Iræ* a foremost place among the masterpieces of sacred song." Of Walter Scott, whose fine paraphrase of a portion of the hymn appeared in the "Lay of the Last Minstrel," Lockhart has narrated this touching death-bed memory: "Whatever we could follow him in was some fragment of the Bible, or

some petition of the Litany, or a verse of some psalm in the old Scotch metrical version, or some of the magnificent hymns of the Romish ritual. We very often heard the cadence of the *Dies Iræ*." And the deeply religious soul of Dr. Samuel Johnson felt so keenly the pathetic allusion of the tenth stanza, "Quaerens me sedisti lassus," as to be melted into tears whenever he would recite it. The Earl of Roscommon died with the cadences of his own version on his lips. Other testimony might be cited, but enough has been given to place *Dies Iræ* as a monumental hymn. The *Stabat Mater* has been "deemed the most pathetic of hymns," as the *Dies Iræ* has been considered the greatest. The compiler of "Seven Great Hymns" says: "In fame it ranks next to the *Dies Iræ*. . . . . It has attracted the same great admiration and been praised and repeated by the same great admirers, but always in a lesser degree." The last clause reminds us that the devout pleadings to Our Lady, found from the fifth stanza to the end of the hymn, grate harshly on ears sensitive in the matter of praise to the Mother of Jesus. Dr. Coles, in the proem to his *Stabat Mater*, says: "Some have gone so far as to place it above its great rival (*sc. Dies Iræ*), but this is not the general judgment, nor is it ours." He thinks "that it owes much of its power to make us admire and weep to the transcendent nature of its theme." He admits, however, that this pathos required the pen of a master to describe. "But however spontaneous and natural,—however true, beautiful, and even poetic,—and however vivid the emotions of sorrow, terror, and pity arising out of these instinctive and uninstructed perceptions, there is a vagueness as well as vividness, and a resulting incapacity to express clearly and adequately what is so genuinely felt. The ability to do this is rare, and rarer still the poetic faculty, whereby the unwritten melody of the heart is accommodated to all lips and sung in all ears. To say that the author of the *Stabat Mater* possessed this power and achieved this triumph, is to bestow upon him and his work the highest praise." The proem of Dr. Coles is worth reading in its entirety. His sympathetic treatment of his theme can almost make us forget the rude language contained in his second paragraph: ". . . . while the devout Protestant finds nothing in the Judgment Hymn to jar with his own religious convictions, he is necessarily offended in the *Stabat Mater* by a devotion he believes misdirected and idolatrous in the adoration which it pays to the Virgin."

The "devout Protestant" needs a schoolmaster or a dictionary. The power of the hymn must be great indeed when it can extort the admiration of those who, at this late day, and in the light of its widely-diffused culture, believe Catholics guilty of the grossness of idolatry or adoration of anything less than God.

Of St. Bernard's hymnody, we may quote the approbation of Duffield in "Latin Hymns:" "The Church universal has made Bernard her own, and the very translations of his verses have been half-inspired." Of the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, we need not speak; its history both in translation and in the Anglican liturgy speaks its praise with no uncertain voice. Dr. John Mason Neale's criticism of the *Pange Lingua* will bring other hymns to memory. It "contests the second place . . . . with the *Vexilla Regis*, the *Stabat Mater*, the *Jesu dulcis memoria*, the *Ad Regias Agni Dapes*, the *Ad Supernam*, and one or two others, leaving the *Dies Iræ* in its unapproachable glory."

It is another glory in the crown of the Latin hymnody that it has furnished suggestions to the best of the Protestant singers for some of their most meritorious and most popular hymns. Paul Gerhard's Passion Hymn, *O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden*, received its inspiration in St. Bernard's *Salve Caput Cruentatum*. The whole rhythmic prayer of the Saint, "*ad unum quodlibet membrorum Christi patientis, et a cruce pendentis*," could have furnished inspiration for many other exquisite poems; for, as Trench justly observes, "its other divisions are of no inferior depth or beauty:" *quae omnia omnes divini amoris spirant aestus atque incendia, ut nil possit suavius dulciusque excogitari*, as Daniel puts it. Speaking of the *Urbs beata Hierusalem*, altered in the Breviary into *Coelestis urbs Jerusalem*, Trench says: "This poem attests its own true inspiration in the fact that it has proved the source of manifold inspiration in circles beyond its own."

The best apology for the number of these extracts from Protestant hymnologists must be the evidence they furnish of the merits and popularity of our grand mediæval hymns. The very attempts at proprietorship made by these men are convincing testimony to the worth of the hymns. The fiction of an invisible church existing somewhere and nowhere which, dating its birth in the birth of Christianity, and throughout the "Dark Ages" clinging silently, unostentatiously to *primitive purity*, linked the great revolt of the sixteenth century to the spirit of the apostolic college—this intangible, unintelligible gratuity of imagination tells us at once of both the repugnance our separated brethren feel at our certain ownership, and of the intense attractiveness these hymns possess for their intellects and hearts. So far is their praise from any admission of Catholic truth, of any amelioration of hostility to the Church, that it is made a very occasion of abuse, of insult, and sometimes of calumnious innuendo. "Romish" is an epithet familiar to the lips of some of the best educated amongst them. In the preface to the first edition of Trench's "Sacred Latin Poetry" we find, amongst other determining factors in the matter of selection of hymns for his

volume, ". . . . all are excluded, which involve any creature-worship, or which speak of the Mother of our Lord in any other language than that which Scripture has sanctioned, and our Church adopted. So, too, all asking of the suffrages of the saints, all addresses to the cross calculated to encourage superstition, that is, in which any value is attributed to the material wood in which it is used otherwise than in the Epistles of St. Paul, namely, as a figure of speech by which we ever and only understand Him that hung upon it; all these have been equally refused a place."

What so tedious as a twice-told tale?

The tale of Catholic explanation and vindication, the indignant denials by Catholic authority and Catholic laymen of the truth of all the hateful assertions and implications contained in the above quotations, have been of such endless iteration as perhaps to render even this notice of them tedious. Our apology shall be, however, that they accentuate the excellence of that muse whose only fault is that she *must* sing the truth.

The Catholic Church possesses, then, a wonderful collection of hymns and sequences—wonderful both in their number and variety, and in the combination of those subtlest elements of genius and poetic inspiration which alone ensure immortality. Possibly the secret of their charm can be stated in a word—they are *hymns*.

The question, *What is a Hymn?* must be answered in terms that postulate, first, a religion that can recognize, and insist upon and perfect the thousand relationships developed towards the Creator by the creature from the high destiny of the latter; secondly, that suppose the adaptability of poetical forms of language, together with their choral drapery, to express adequately the high conceptions born of such a religion; thirdly, that imply the quickening power of divine faith on the intellect, the will, the emotions. To write a *hymn*—using the word in its general meaning, but in its highest sense—a man must be a Christian, a poet, and a lover of God.

The first essential of a hymn, viz., that it should be Christian, should be a dwelling-place of truth, and should be built on a foundation of truth, may be gleaned from the history of religion. The Sacred Text, while giving a history of true religion, gives also a prominent place in its pages to the service of divine praise. It will include St. Paul's several references to the hymnody of the first Christians; that touching recital of how "an hymn being said," Christ went out with His disciples after the Last Supper, unto Olivet; the choral service of the First and Second Temple; the songs of Isaias, David, Debora, Barac; the long canticles of Mary and Moses by the Red Sea. The retrospect, of which we

have but hinted at a part, closes with the early dawn of creation, when "the sons of God made a joyful melody." Religion it was which first gave the impulse to song; and to chants of divine faith and love were first dedicated the rhythmic cadences and the fine imagery of poetic speech. "If we trace poetry back to its origin," says M. Rollin, "I think we cannot question but it had its rise from the very source of human nature, and was no other art at first than the voice and expression of the heart of man, when nourished and transported with the view of the sole object deserving to be loved, and alone capable of making him happy. . . . . This is properly the original of poetry, and herein its essence principally consists. Hence arise the enthusiasm of the poets, the fruitfulness of invention, the nobleness of sentiments and ideas, the sallies of imagination, the magnificence and boldness of terms, the love of what is grand, sublime, and marvellous." The pagans were not slow to recognize the essential province of poetry, and although their dedication of it to the worship of gods that "have ears and hear not" was a prostitution of its high office, still it was an evidence of how the heart clamors for such a vehicle of religious emotion. But the really informing spirit of true poetry was absent; and drawn in the mire of a gross and sensual mythology, it soon fell so palpably from its noble estate, as to furnish suggestions of evil rather than of good; and therefore Plato banished poets from his *Republic*. The Christian poet reverses the order of Homer. Of the latter Cicero said: "*humana ad deos transferebat; mallem divina ad nos.*" The religious poetry of the ancients was a laughing-stock to the philosophers; they felt no vivifying influences lying hidden beneath the drapery of human invention. The words of many of the classic hymns have come down to our times; but as hymns they have perished forever. The heart of the most cultured infidel classicist feels at this day no quickening breath of emotion, no idealizing of its aspirations, coming from their deep-sounding rhythms. The hymns that shall endure must be an expression of truth and of faith; and under the new dispensation of grace, this is but to say that they must be *Catholic*, must express Catholic truth, whether peculiar to the New Law, or descending to it as an heirloom of the Old Law.

The poetry of Christendom is in many respects an expression of its philosophy. What phase of Christian truth or sentiment has not found in it a ready voice and an enduring interpretation? Hell is not too deep, nor Heaven too lofty for its reach; life is not too real, death is not too mysterious for its ken. We can therefore say of the Christian singer what Mr. Leslie Stephen said of Wordsworth's poetry, that it is precious because his philosophy is sound; that his "ethical system is as distinctive and capable of

exposition as Bishop Butler's"; that his poetry is informed by ideas which "fall spontaneously into a scientific system of thought." With regard to Wordsworth's muse, Matthew Arnold's opposite comment may be just: "His poetry is the reality, his philosophy —so far, at least, as it may put on the form and habit of a scientific system of thought, and the more that it puts them on—is the illusion." It is not, however, necessary that this living truth should find formal expression in a hymn, but that the spirit of a solid conviction of divine truth pervade it. And just this is the grand, pervading, and prevailing spirit of Catholic hymnody; and herein lies the most distinctive discrimination between it and the hymnody of Protestantism. The same can be said of the Catholic sermon and the Protestant sermon; neither rhetoric nor oratory can kindle the hidden fire—*cor ad cor loquitur!* The hymn, after all, is a sermon, and like it, can find its way to the heart, and thence to God's throne. Vagueness, sentimentality, and fictitious emotion shall easily take the place of precision of thought, solid devotion, and reasonable piety, when the singer's faith is not clear, systematic, and wholly unquestioning. If philosophy oppose faith, then have the Christian singers of old already realized the "perhaps" of Mr. Arnold: "Perhaps we shall one day learn to make this proposition general, and to say, poetry is the reality, philosophy the illusion."

Again, the Christian singer must be a Poet—not merely an elegant versifier, a master mechanician in

> The clock-work tintinnabulum of rhyme.

He must be able to see, as by an abiding instinct, and without conscious effort, the spiritual lesson

> Of splendor in the grass, of glory in the flower.

In this sense, many a "mute inglorious Milton" rests beneath the sod he once could read as a book; and many a one whose "tongue is now a stringless instrument" found it in life too ready an instrument for counterfeiting the divine frenzy. And so there are many poets who sing not songs. Indeed, the literature of hagiology might show us many intimate relationships between sanctity and poesy; certainly, St. Francis of Assisi, finding a perpetual delight and inspiration in all of God's creatures, and St. Francis of Sales, reading lessons of sweetest asceticism from every page in the book of nature, were poets as well as saints. It is not necessary that the Christian singer, even in the presentation of the sublimest conceptions, should fill our ears with the organ-storms of a Milton, or

The varying verse, the full resounding line,
The long majestic march, and energy divine

of a Dryden. If he be a true poet, like Wordsworth, he will not need such accessories to move the heart. He possesses the secret which can enable him to build a worthy palace of song, not of the "Apocalyptical splendors" of rare marbles and precious stones, but of the common earth which the Lord "hath given to the children of men." This may explain the apparent anomaly in the history of certain hymns, preserved and kept in high honor and perpetual use, though from a literary standpoint falling below the merits of others doomed to an early obscurity. Thus some of the most finished productions of the classical *Renaissance* belong to the purely historical phase of hymnology. They are found in exhaustive collections, but not in hymnals. Many of exquisite diction have not received even the poor honor of a translation. The hymns for a new Breviary, prepared by Ferreri, received this praise from the cultured Latinist, Marino Becichemi: "That his hymns and odes, beyond all doubt, will secure him immortality, I need not conceal. Certainly I have read nothing in Christian poets sweeter, purer, terser, or brighter, How brief and how copious, each in its place—how polished! Everywhere the stream flows in full channel with that antique Roman mode of speech, except where of full purpose it turns in another direction."[1] But Ferreri's work seems to have passed almost immediately into mere history. On the other hand, the hymns called *Ambrosiani*, the product of various centuries that witnessed the decline of classic Latin, and even those whose authentic ascription to St. Ambrose gives them a life far extended beyond that of most hymns—these *Ambrosiani* have survived the obscuring dust of the ages and may claim the immortality predicted for his own work by the greatest of Roman lyrists. Compared with his elegant muse they seem the work of an unskillful tyro, whose wildest dream of fame could not flatter his soul into the triumphant strain:

"Exegi monumentum aere perennius."

The Christian singers found the *divinus afflatus* taking shape in their souls, not in the playful fictions of the imagination, but in the devout aspirations of the heart. They went up into the temple to pray. Trench's beautiful reference to St. Ambrose might be applied to many a Christian poet: "It is as though, building an altar to the living God, he would observe the Levitical precept and rear it of unhewn stones upon which no tool had been lifted." Nevertheless, despite the absence of bold figures, vivid word-painting

[1] Duffield's *Latin Hymns*, p. 319.

and the rest of the poetic paraphernalia, the beatings of the strong heart of the poet are heard, giving its best rhythm to the rude verse. Perhaps this will explain the ill success of most of our modern hymns, Catholic and Protestant. The trappings of "fine-writing" are poor embellishments of prayer. This age has many exquisite versifiers, but few poets.

Since a hymn has for its purpose the elevation of the soul to heavenly things, it is of the nature of a prayer. The true singer should be a Lover of God. The honest piety of the man should shine through his verse. But piety is far removed from sentimentality; it is so earnest in the most practical affair of life, the service of God, that it cannot tolerate any counterfeit; and it is so intensely in earnest that it will frequently show itself in extreme emotion. Sentiment it will admit, but not sentimentality. The Latin hymns are full of the robust, manly vigor of true piety; and, when occasion justifies it, overflowing with tender sentiment. But, while they will not attempt to dress up in human finery the

"Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears,"

they will admit any expression that ecstatic love may suggest. St. Bernard's *Jesu dulcis memoria*, St. Francis Xavier's "love-sigh," as the hymn *O Deus ego amo te*, has been called, are examples of this intense feeling clothing itself in words which do not seem sentimental, however full they are of sentiment. The Church enshrines St. Bernard's hymn in the Office of the Most Holy Name of Jesus. The sweetness of piety is appreciated in every line; and in the two stanzas given here there is no apparent attempt at "fine-writing," no unpleasant suggestion of labored exclamation:

"Jesu dulcis memoria,
Dans vera cordis gaudia:
Sed super mel et omnia
Ejus dulcis praesentia.

"Nil canitur suavius,
Nil auditur jucundius;
Nil cogitatur dulcius
Quam Jesus Dei Filius."

Nor is the sweetness intelligible only as an effect of grace of diction or melody of sound. Caswall's translation into a different English stanza, and into the less musical elements of Anglo-Saxon, melts the heart with a fire hardly less intense:

"Jesu! the very thought of Thee
With sweetness fills my breast,
But sweeter far thy face to see
And in thy presence rest.

"Nor voice can sing, nor heart can frame,
Nor can the memory find,
A sweeter sound than thy blest name,
O Saviour of mankind!"

Father Faber's "Jesus, my God and my All," is not a translation, but it will exemplify, although with less force than the cry of St. Bernard, the distinction between emotion and sentimentality. We give below Stanzas I. and IV.:

"O Jesus, Jesus! dearest Lord!
Forgive me if I say
For very love Thy Sacred Name
A thousand times a day.

"The craft of this wise world of ours
Poor wisdom seems to me;
Ah! dearest Jesus! I have grown
Childish with love of Thee!"

In these Latin and English stanzas, that kind of exclamatory style is employed which has been constantly used to counterfeit devotion. But, however nearly the base metal may mimic the gold, it can be detected by its ring—and the poetic ears of St. Bernard and Father Faber were sensitive to true poetry!

The ideal hymn, then, should combine Catholic truth, poetic power, and loving affection. As a body of hymns, the Latin treasures of the Church are pre-eminent for the blending of these three requisites. It is not strange, therefore, to find them exercising such a potent spell over the affections of our separated brethren. The zest of antiquarian research may explain much of the critical work of hymnologists, but to another source must be ascribed the endless translations of the hymns into the vernacular, and the introduction of many of them into the hymnals of the various denominations of Protestantism. Most of the translations have, as their originals, the hymns in the grand hymnal of the Roman Breviary. This work, the subject of much revision (some of which has been criticised by hymnologists for ultra-classicism) has proved a casket to countless jewels which, else, might have rested in as great obscurity as Gray's "full many a gem of purest ray serene." The Roman Breviary proved a very accessible storehouse of hymns, and of hymns, too, of exceptional merit. And to this double fact can be ascribed the countless versions made from it into English. But other missals, breviaries, and hymnals than the Roman, have supplied no inconsiderable amount of original matter for translation. It would be an endless task to pursue the history of the hymnody, Catholic and Protestant, of the different nations and epochs. Rather do we hasten

to a brief consideration of the subject of translations into English of hymns and sequences from the Roman Missal and Breviary.

Despite the fact that there are at present in the world some 400,000 hymns, many of them being original, many of them translations from the Roman Breviary, this endless profusion of choral treasures seems but to awaken a craving for more original work and more versions from the Latin. The hymn finds a partial analogue in the sermon. A comparison between hymnologic and homiletic activity would not, indeed, be a just one in all its phases. For the sermon suffers by age and repetition, but the hymn, if acceptable at first, is apt to improve on familiar acquaintance. But the sermon and the hymn agree in one striking peculiarity—they belong to the most difficult species of composition. The very elements of the former which might seem to predict success are, in truth, prophets of failure. In the hands of a celebrated British statesman they became telling points in his arraignment of preachers for the poor result of all their advantages! But, indeed, the sublimity of the themes, their appeal to the best instincts of the heart, their eternal verity—these may constitute the grandeur of the sermon, but they in no wise lessen its difficulty. To dress big thoughts in small clothes, to make the same stuffs furnish out a wardrobe varying for every festival of the year, to weave the eternal threads into ever-changing patterns of beauty; to be forever the prudent householder, bringing forth at the suitable times "things new and old"; to brush off in a brief moment the dust of worldliness from men's souls; to speak of Heaven in terms of earth, of eternity in terms of time—this is to achieve a notable triumph if done even with mediocre success. Like the sermon, the hymn speaks of Heaven, of Eternity, of stern-faced duty, of siren-tongued pleasure. It is, in its own way, a sermon. But, like the sermon, it will admit neither of the brilliant argumentation of the cultured logician, nor the dreamy subjectivism of the fine-frenzied poet. It must be sublime with the themes of a Milton, but simple with the expression of a Wordsworth. It may not be the pure product of intellect or of heart; but must, with nicest instinct, so justly satisfy the claims of both as to avoid cold speculation on the one hand, and insipid effusiveness on the other. And always the singer must be a Christian, a poet, a lover! Add to all this the fact that the hymn is written with a view to choral treatment, and cannot avail itself at will of the rhythms, cadences, metrical moulds of widely-differing stanzas, which give not only the pleasure of variety, but the force of appropriateness to poetry; and add the other fact, that like the sonnet, it must present a complete thought in a condensed form,—and we have a congeries of difficulties that may easily baffle both industry and genius. And

it is worthy of note that the shining lights in the firmament of poetry, the epoch-making names of literature, have not excelled as hymnodists. Some have written sacred poems, but only a few have produced hymns of more than mediocre worth. A glance at our own literature would show this. The opening verses of Cædmon's *Song of Creation* are hymnodal in character, and are, perhaps, strong in their very rudeness; Chaucer's *La Prière de Nostre Dame* is also acceptable for its tenderness and, to our eye, quaintness—to quote a stanza which, while one of the most touching, does not display exceptional hymnodal merit:

> Gloriouse mayde and moder! which that never
> Were bitter nor in erthe nor in see,
> But ful of swetnesse and of mercye ever,
> Help, that my fader be not wrothe with me!
> Speke thow, for I ne dar nat him yse;
> So have I doon in erthe, allas the while!
> That certes, but that thow my socour be,
> To synke eterne he wol my goost exile.

Jonson's *Hymn to God the Father*, is exquisite in its versification; but George Herbert wrote many such; Milton, outside of his metrical rendering of the Psalms, wrote hymns on the Passion, Circumcision, "at a Solemn Music," and an unfinished hymn on the Nativity, priceless as a poem, but in no modern sense a *Hymn*. Dryden's great *Ode on St. Cecilia's Day*, although treating of a religious subject, or rather putting a religious finish to a secular theme, is, of course, not a hymn. Pope's tender address of "The Dying Christian to His Soul," is true poetry, but it is rather a sacred poem than a hymn. Walter Scott's *Hymn to the Virgin*, in the "Lady of the Lake," is really a hymn, but indicates no very special poetic power. Wordsworth's *My Heart Leaps Up*, partakes somewhat of the nature of a hymn, but its fragmentary form and its purely reflective character stamp it more justly as a sacred meditation. Moore's "Thou Art, O God," is a hymn. His "This world is all a fleeting show" is rather a sacred meditation. Tennyson's prologue to "In Memoriam," has furnished stanzas which, altered in various hymnals, have been sung as hymns by Protestants; but its diction and abstruseness detract from its hymnodal character.

It is not an easy task, then, to write a hymn. And it is not a matter of surprise that there should be so many attempts to satisfy the need, or that the peculiar excellence of Latin hymns should have been recognized in such multitudinous and multiform translations. The history of these versions discloses the remarkable fact that there is a possibility of constantly increasing perfection in translations. And since this is true, it is to be deplored that

Catholics, who should have the best title to such work, have been so remiss in attempting and so careless in performing it. As a rule, the best translations have been made by Protestants, or at least by converts from Protestantism. Out of the long list of names that could be quoted, among the former we may mention the names of Rev. Dr. Neale, General Dix, and Dr. Coles, a physician; amongst the latter, Edward Caswall and Dr. Newman. Although there are many Catholic versions, there is still room for others. Even if these should not excel in merit the work of Protestants, we should at least be spared the humiliating necessity of going to non-Catholic sources for the translations found in our prayer-books and other devotional manuals. In the "Manual of Prayers" published by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, the version of the *Dies Iræ*—that hymn of endless translation—is a modified form of the version of a Protestant, Dr. Irons. Dr. Irons' first stanza reads:

> Day of Wrath! O Day of mourning!
> See! once more the cross returning,
> Heav'n and earth in ashes burning!

It is a translation of the Parisian emendation *Crucis expandens vexilla*. In the "Manual" the third line restores the original *Teste David cum Sybilla*, but at the expense of a questionable rhyming:

> Seer and sybil gave the warning.

We have, therefore, a stanza containing not one perfect rhyme. Again, the fifth stanza rhymes "worded" with "awarded." Again, in the Marquis of Bute's Roman Breviary appear many translations by Protestants. He also found it necessary, apparently, to select, with slight alteration, the version printed by Dr. Neale of the *Pange Lingua*, "which," says the doctor, "claims no other merit than an attempt to unite the best portions of the four best translations with which I am acquainted—Mr. Wackerbarth's, Dr. Pusey's, the Leeds Book and Mr. Caswall's (which last, however, omits the double rhymes)." It seems to us that there should be such a profusion of Catholic translations of Catholic hymns as to create an *embarras de richesse*, and not what would appear to be an embarrassment of poverty. But the work of translation is not easy; and in view of the fact that many skilled hands have already devoted themselves to this task, and much unselfish energy has been spent upon it, it is clear that the coming translator must be alike of transcendent ability and of unflagging industry. We have altogether too many translations, and altogether too few. The pity is that the work is too often esteemed the passing pleasure

of an idle moment. The sin lies not, indeed, in the harmless amusement of translation, but in the literary crime of publishing the translation. For then the true interests of the hymn are baffled; mistaken judgment is passed either against the hymn, or against all translations. It is surely a mistake to allege against the merits of the hymn, or the possibility of a good version of it into the vernacular, the crude performances of the million. Let the critic, scholar, and poet give his labor and his love to the attempt, and forthwith his translation becomes a thing of life and beauty. We are not arguing against, but contending here for, the principle of an abundance of translations—but better ones!

The history of translation shows how, little by little, the difficulties offered to such attempts by the monumental hymns have been triumphantly combated. The *Dies Iræ* is an illustration. The earlier attempts at translation appear at the present day exceedingly crude, careless, unsympathetic. Many of them were mere paraphrases; many of them never ventured on a similar metrical and rhymic effect with the original. Perhaps the best illustration, however, will be found in that angelic song of the "Angelic Doctor," the *Pange Lingua.* Its melody has ravished the souls even of Protestants; its wonderful crystallization of thought has been their theme of praise; its clear, dogmatic utterances, an abomination in their ears. But with many of our separated brethren its beauty has proved too attractive; and so, with mutilated text and "spiritual" sense, it has found its way into their service of song. In the translation of such a masterpiece of melody, poetry, thought and dogma, there should be evidence, not of careless haste, but of the most painstaking accuracy, and the most sympathetic labor. For such a spirit must we give the Anglican, Dr. John Mason Neale, the credit and the sincerest praise. His patient industry and love for his task must seem to us somewhat like an unconscious rebuke to our own listlessness and *cui bono* temperament. This is the spirit in which he approached the task of furnishing the English repertory with a version of the great hymn: "It has been a bow of Ulysses to translators. The translation above given claims no other merit than an attempt to unite the best portions of the four best translations with which I am acquainted, Mr. Wackerbarth's, Dr. Pusey's, that of the Leeds book, and Mr. Caswall's (which last, however, omits the double rhymes). Chiefly where, as in the first line, and the fourth and fifth verses, all seemed to me to fail, I have ventured another attempt, possibly to display another failure. In the latter, the two concluding lines, *Præstet fides supplementum Sensuum defectui,* are avoided by all. The versions are: 'Faith, the senses dark refining Mysteries to comprehend; Faith, thine earnest adoration,

Passing eye and touch, present.' Mr. Caswall's translation, unshackled by rhyme, is nearest: 'Faith for all defects supplying, where the feeble senses fail.'" He pays special attention to the fourth stanza, which runs in the original thus:

Verbum caro panem verum
Verbo carnem efficit:
Fitque sanguis Christi merum,
Et si sensus deficit,
Ad firmandum cor sincerum
Sola fides sufficit.

"The great *crux* of the translator is the fourth verse. I give all the translations: 1. 'God the Word by one word maketh Very Bread His Flesh to be: And whoso that Cup partaketh, Tastes the Fount of Calvary: While the carnal mind forsaketh, Faith receives the Mystery.' Here the *incarnation* of the Word, so necessary to the antithesis, is omitted, and so exact a writer as S. Thomas would never have used the expression *by* ONE *word*. 2. 'At the Incarnate Word's high bidding, Very Bread to Flesh doth turn: Wine becometh CHRIST'S Blood-shedding: And, if sense cannot discern, Guileless spirits, never dreading, May from Faith sufficient learn.' Here the antithesis is utterly lost by the substitution of *Incarnate* for *made flesh*, and *bidding* for *word*, to say nothing of *Blood-shedding* for *Blood*. 3. 'Word made Flesh! The Bread of nature, Thou by word to Flesh dost turn: Wine, to Blood of our Creator: If no sense the work discern, Yet the true heart proves no traitor: Faith, unaided, all shall learn.' Here the antithesis is preserved, though at the expense of the vocative case. And surely S. Thomas, in an exact dogmatical poem, would not have spoken of the Blood of our *Creator*. Mr. Caswall, following up the hint given by the last version, and substituting the apposite pronoun for the vocative, has given, as from his freedom of rhyme might be expected, the best version: 'Word made Flesh, the Bread of nature, By a word to Flesh He turns: Wine into His Blood He changes: What though sense no change discerns, Only be the heart in earnest, Faith the lesson quickly learns.' In both these last translations, however, the panem *verum* of S. Thomas is not given, and Mr. Caswall brings in the worse than unnecessary article—By *a* word. Since the first edition of my book, 'Hymns, Ancient and Modern' have produced a translation put together from former ones, but nearer my own version than to any other. Their fourth verse is their weakest:

"'Word made Flesh, True Bread He maketh
By His word His Flesh to be:
Wine His Blood, *which whoso taketh,*
Must from carnal thoughts be free:
Faith alone, though sight forsaketh,
Shows true hearts the Mystery.'

"It is needless to observe that the italicized line and a half is not in the original. *Forsaketh*, too, is scarcely English. I have substituted an alteration of 'Hymns, Ancient and Modern' for my original fifth verse" (quoted from the third edition of Dr. Neale's "Mediæval Hymns and Sequences," 1867).

We may be pardoned the long extract because of the many lessons it teaches the future translator. It shows, first, the critical and patient industry that will exhaust every expedient to preserve intact the essential meaning of the hymn, the pointedness of its several antitheses, the melody of its versification, and its rhymic, or, rather, assonantal excellence. The more important lesson is, however, the lesson of triumph over the inherent difficulties so critically pointed out. Patience will surely be rewarded with ever-increasing excellence in the translation. The lesson receives even greater accentuation by comparing the later translations with those found in earlier hymn-books and retained even in the latter-day reprints. For sake of emphasis, we place beside each other an early version and that found in the "Manual of Prayers Prepared and Published by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore."

A.

The Word, made flesh for love of man,
His word turns bread to flesh again,
And wine to blood, unseen by sense,
By virtue of Omnipotence;
And here the faithful rest secure,
Whilst God can vouch and faith insure.

B.

Word-made-Flesh, true bread He maketh
By His word His Flesh to be;
Wine His Blood; which whoso taketh
Must from carnal thoughts be free;
Faith alone, though sight forsaketh,
Shows true hearts the Mystery.

Version B has the metre and double-rhyming of the original; version A has neither. The first line of version A has, moreover, the harshness of a grammatical construction, or rather want of construction, which the English grammarians might term *absolute*. Version B, which is that of the Protestant hymnal, "Hymns Ancient and Modern," has all the defects pointed out by Dr. Neale. It is, nevertheless, a far better translation than A. Dr. Neale's is a better version, but somewhat crude in expression, although not more so than B. Under the heading D we print beside it the latest (and a Catholic) version:

C.

Word made Flesh, by Word He maketh
Very Bread His flesh to be;
Man in wine Christ's Blood partaketh,
And if senses fail to see,
Faith alone the true heart waketh
To behold the Mystery.

D.

Into Flesh the true bread turneth
By His word, the Word made Flesh;
Wine to Blood: while sense discerneth
Naught beyond the sense's mesh,
Faith an awful mystery learneth,
And must teach the soul afresh.

Dr. Neale's version is given in the Marquis of Bute's translation

of the Roman Breviary. But a further critical emendation is made, and with great propriety, the word *generosi* in the verse *Fructus ventris generosi* being translated *noble* and not *generous*, as Neale has it. A foot-note (vol. ii., p. 565) indicates other corrections.

The *Pange Lingua* in translation would afford yet ampler illustration of our argument if, haply, the further illustration would not grow tedious. Enough has been selected, however, to show that, despite the endless translations of Latin hymns, there is room for a constantly increasing weight of excellence. But the task must be approached with a critical, poetic, and, above all, most patient and painstaking spirit.

A diligent study of the translations of the more difficult Latin hymns would furnish suggestions of great value in the matter of future translations. It would demonstrate the advisability of as close a similarity with the originals in metrical form as possible. For, aside from the beauty and inspiration which linger about the traditional cadences, there is the strong æsthetic power in the mere form to which the survival of a hymn through many ages must attribute some of its success. What was a poetic metrical inspiration to the composer cannot be lightly disregarded by the translator. An attempt should be made, too, to preserve a rhymic similarity with the original. But, then, no excuse is accepted for poor rhyming. If the hymn will not yield to graceful rhyme, better a simple prose translation, which shall at least present the simple grandeur of the thought unadorned with a tawdry and wholly unsuccessful finery. The truth seems to be, however, that nearly every difficulty will yield to industrious ability. Even the *Dies Iræ*, whose many translations would serve, apparently, to demonstrate the impossibility of a perfect version, has been treated with constantly increasing perfection of rhyme, rhythm, and literalness. The *Dies Iræ* will stand as a type of the difficulties to be met with in the greatest Latin hymns. The history of its versions might serve, also, as a type of the other translations. The number of really excellent renderings is small. Of the others, many cannot in strictness be styled translations; many employ, instead of the measures of the original, less effective and easier English metres. Others preserve the exact metre at the expense of smoothness. Some writers, desiring to be faithful, have become servile, and have preserved the thought only to present it in an unattractive, if not positively repelling, garb; they weigh the measure down with sesquipedalian words of Latin derivation,—the "ations" and the "essions" *et id genus omne* of Latin terminations forming a storehouse of rhymes well-nigh exhaustless; they stick not at a rhyme whose strangeness almost startles the reader, and

diverts very thoroughly his attention from the sequence of thought to a bewildered consideration of the meaning first, and then the appositeness of the word; their inversions emulate the intricacies of Teutonic syntax, and shame the straightforward simplicity of the mediæval original; they make harsh consonantal sounds grind against each other until we begin to fear that the verse, which was designed to run smoothly, is on the very verge of dropping a wheel.

The task of illustrating the above remarks with extracts would be nearly as endless as it is easy. This want of success is due in many cases, we think, to an exaggerated ideal of fidelity to the original. That the translation should be faithful goes, of course, without saying. It is, nevertheless, difficult to locate the golden mean that shall not sacrifice fidelity, on the one side, to the arbitrary requirements of poetic form; nor, on the other, win exactness at the expense of beauty. Perhaps, between the extremes of servility and license there will be, on the question of deciding this golden mean, *tot sententiae quot capita.* We think, however, that where the poem is not an exact dogmatical exposition (as are, in substance, the hymns in "Off. SS. Sacramenti"), but a free and poetical train of thought, and of thought that belongs to the whole Christian world in common (as so many of the hymns are), a larger liberty in translation will be conceded by all, than where the poem is more peculiarly the personal property, so to speak, of the poet. Especially may the *Dies Iræ* be allowed a large treatment, if the gain in beauty be corresponding. Sublime thoughts are, after all, cheap enough. They come to the Christian ready-made. We live in the commonplace of miracles. And it is, therefore, more than likely that Thomas of Celano rejected, after trial, many a more 'sublime' thought, and many a more grandly 'simple' expression of it, simply for the reason that one can't have everything in this world; and that one of the first requirements of a poem is that its harmony be not disturbed by the unwise introduction of a *theme* (to speak musically), which, however striking and meritorious, interrupts the sequence of melody, or constitutes an unresolved discord. To avoid harshness on the one hand, and to secure beauty on the other, it is therefore allowable, surely, to shear, not flay, the thought of the original occasionally, and, with the greater reason, to vary an unimportant figure of speech. We are not pleading the cause of license; unless, indeed, it be that poetic license which is, as has been prettily said, "a license of power and grace, and not of weakness and deformity."

While the devotional repertory of English-speaking Catholics would receive valuable additions in finely-executed translations of the great hymns of the Church, there would not be wanting to the

patient student and translator of the hymns another motive to spur him on in his self-imposed task. There shall be no lack of personal gain. Nothing can take the place of translation in the acquiring of a familiarity with the finest discriminations of thought and expression. But a higher gain remains. The study of hymnology is in some measure a reverent and sympathetic fellowship with the mighty men of old,—the dearer fellowship, for that their heart of hearts is speaking to us, not in cold terms of thought merely, but in the fiery shafts of spiritual ecstasy. Behind the poem is the man, behind the song is the singer, behind the hymn is the Christian. The history of hymnology is, therefore, a compendium of the devotional history of the Church. From the *Magnificat* of Our Lady, down even to the latest hymns in the Office of her Rosary, the devotion of Christianity has been a history written in song.

The hymns have come to our ears laden with the traditions of the centuries. They have been sanctified by an endless iteration on the lips of the wisest and best and dearest of the children of God. They have been a solace to the Confessor, an inspiration of strength to the Martyr. They are pathetic and holy with the tears and triumphs of the innumerable multitude who in all ages and in all climes "have washed their robes in the Blood of the Lamb." They preach to us with a new emphasis the Catholicity of a Church which exhausts time and space; for their burden of praise shall still be heard when "the former things are passed away."

H. T. Henry.

ENGLISH LIBERTY FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE TRIUMPH OF THE PRINCE OF ORANGE.

BEFORE entering on the treatment of our subject, it would be well to briefly advert to the fundamental guarantees of liberty, and to the state of society, prior to the passing of the sceptre from the hands of Catholic to the hands of Protestant sovereigns. The *Magna Charta*, which Hallam calls the keystone of British liberty, was in full force. It had weathered the storm; it had emerged from the clouds radiant and triumphant. It was, in the civil order, what the sun is in the physical. As the planets move in their orbits obedient to the sun, so did the different classes of society move in the paths marked out for them by the *Magna Charta*. The king and the legislator, the priest and the noble, the artisan and the trader, the farmer and the laborer, lived, moved, and had their being in it. Obedience to it had become normal, and any disturbance in its relations was felt and checked. The legislation of a parliament which spurned the maxim, *A Deo rex, a rege lex*, as is evidenced by the fact that it claimed and exercised the exclusive right of taxation and of making all laws of what kind soever, was the outgrowth of its principles. The common law, the child of Catholic thought, Catholic learning, and Catholic teaching, had attained a degree of wisdom, beauty, and perfection which made it the equal of any system of jurisprudence hitherto known; and its administration by the courts was honest, fearless, and able. Every safeguard was thrown around the absolute rights of individuals, and many of the subordinate rights to which subsequent ages have laid claim, were enjoyed to an extent which the vanity and bigotry of this day are loath to acknowledge. Liberty had the sanction and security of law, and law was sovereign. Before its majesty the majesty of kings bowed, and under its ægis the lowly felt ennobled. Hallam, in considering the polity of England at the accession of Henry VII., says: "The essential checks upon the royal authority were five in number: 1. The king could levy no sort of new tax upon his people, except by grant of his parliament, consisting as well of bishops and mitred abbots or lords spiritual, and of hereditary peers or temporal lords, who sat and voted promiscuously in the same chamber, as of representatives from the freeholders of each county, and from the burgesses of many towns and less considerable places, forming the lower or commons' house. 2. The previous assent and authority of the

same assembly were necessary for every new law, whether of a general or temporary nature. 3. No man could be committed to prison but by a legal warrant specifying his offence; and by an usage, nearly tantamount to constitutional right, he must be speedily brought to trial by means of regular sessions of jail-delivery. 4. The fact of guilt or innocence, on a criminal charge, was determined in a public court, and in the county where the offence was alleged to have occurred, by a jury of twelve men, from whose unanimous verdict no appeal could be made. Civil rights, so far as they depended on questions of fact, were subject to the same decision. 5. The officers and servants of the crown, violating the personal liberty, or other right of the subject, might be sued in an action for damages, to be assessed by a jury, or, in some cases, were liable to criminal process; nor could they plead any warrant or command in their justification, not even the direct order of the king."[1] Further on, in the same chapter, he asserts that, "there is not a single instance, from the first dawn of our constitutional history, where a proclamation or order of council has dictated any change, however trifling, in the code of private rights, or in the penalties of criminal offences."

The feudal system had gone down never to be revived. Villeinage, its worst feature, was no more. The Church, ever and everywhere, the enemy of slavery, had so battled against it that even bitterly hostile to her as Lord Macaulay was, he says that, "before the Reformation came, she had enfranchised almost all the bondsmen in the kingdom."[2]

The judicial torture, which outraged civilization in later times, was unknown. Religious unity produced peace and happiness. All classes knelt before the same altar, and before that altar the beggar was the peer of the monarch. There, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man was a reality and not a catching phrase of the empty demagogue. Institutions abounded where misery was solaced, and the infirm cared for. There were universities for the opulent, and schools for all classes. The question of labor, which now threatens to convulse the world, was then so adjusted that the sons of toil rejoiced in a comfort which those of this day vainly struggle to obtain.

England's commercial and naval greatness, then as now, was celebrated. Recent discoveries, especially that of printing, were made the vehicles of her renown. Her Cabots, following the track of Columbus, had claimed for her El Dorados in the great West. They made tributary to her a land which in the flight of years was des-

---

[1] *Constitutional History of England*, vol. i., pp. 18, 19.
[2] *History of England*, vol. i., p. 33.

tined to rescue her liberty from the tyranny that menaced its annihilation in the country of its birth, and to perpetuate it for the oppressed of all nations, with the stars for its shield and for its aspirations.

True, the evils inseparable from human society sometimes threw a dark shadow over this picture. War, and the worst of all wars, a civil war, had deluged the land in fraternal blood, and, at times, paralyzed the course of justice. *Inter arma silent leges* was no idle maxim, but often a condition in the terrible conflict of the Roses. From out that conflict, however,—a conflict which unhappily prepared the way for a stormy, tyrannical, and bloody era —the English constitution came forth in its purity and integrity, adequate to all the wants of a free monarchy, and bearing in its bosom the seeds of life for the varying conditions of society throughout all time. Such was England's constitution and England when the sceptre passed from Catholic to Protestant hands.

The era of the Reformation opens. The lust of Henry VIII. was the match that ignited this conflagration whose destructive fury spared neither life, liberty, nor property. The *Magna Charta* and the confirmatory statutes were not worth the paper upon which they were written. The Reformation was a conspiracy against fundamental rights, and was, admittedly, to the body politic what the heart is to the natural body. At the same time that Henry threw off the supremacy of the Pope, he threw off the supremacy of the law, and the Church which he enabled his son and successor to establish "continued to be," says Lord Macaulay, "for more than a hundred and fifty years the servile handmaid of monarchy, the steady enemy of public liberty. The divine right of kings, and the duty of passively obeying all their commands, were her favorite tenets."[1]

From Henry's reign, until not a very remote day, the liberties of England as established by Catholics were not, even theoretically, acknowledged by any sovereign except Mary. "It is due, indeed," says Hallam, "to the memory of one who has left so odious a name, to remark that Mary was conscientiously averse to encroach upon what she understood to be the privileges of her people. A wretched book having been written to exalt her prerogative on the ridiculous pretence that, as queen, she was not bound by the laws of former kings, she showed it to Gardiner, and on his expressing indignation at the sophism, threw it herself into the fire."[2] Her charge to Morgan, when she appointed him Chief-Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, leaves no doubt as to her good disposi-

---

[1] Macaulay's *Essays*, vol. i., p. 324.

[2] *Constitutional History of England*, vol. i., p. 55.

tions—dispositions which her evil circumstances unhappily interfered with. "I charge you, sir," said she, "to maintain the law and justice indifferently, without respect of person, and, notwithstanding the old error among you which will not admit any witness to speak, or other matter to be heard, in favor of the adversary, the crown being a party, it is my pleasure that whatever can be brought in favor of the subject may be admitted and heard. You are to sit there, not as advocate for me, but as indifferent judge between me and my people."[1]

During the long interval between 1534, when Henry became head of the Church, and 1688, when William of Orange triumphed over James II., England's government was either absolute or anarchical. What a sad and harrowing history do these one hundred and fifty-four years unfold to our view! Who can read it without horror and indignation? While there is much of comedy in it, it is, in the main, a series of tragedies, and the pathetic strains of the *Miserere* mingled with the wild wailings of Rachels, pierce the heart through all the shifting scenes.

In vain did the weak and oppressed call for the restoration of the constitution as it existed before the Reformation; their call was met with the cry of treason. Tower, torture, confiscation, banishment, and barbarous execution, still the voice of restoration and reform. Much that is noble in man is made treason, and much that is vile, loyalty. Concessions wrenched are not observed, and when those who wrenched them gain power they, in turn, trample on them. In the struggle for ascendency no obligation is held sacred. Division and dissension are everywhere, and, whoever triumphs, persecution reigns. It is war to the knife between the sects, who never cease their hostility except when the Catholic Church looms into open view. Having driven her into the by-ways and hiding-places, they resume the work of hate in the name of the God of charity, and thus demonstrate to the world that religion divorced from authority is madness pure and simple. To-day the Episcopalian is in the ascendant, and the Mores and the Fishers suffer for their virtues. To-morrow, the sceptre passes to the Catholic for a short time, the only time during this period of one hundred and fifty-four years, except the time of James II., whose reign, as well as that of Mary, was so hampered by the Reformers that they must take the responsibility of it.

"Bloody" Mary's few years of government have furnished more models of vituperative and pathetic declamation than the ten persecutions. If the tears that were shed over them in Sunday-schools, revivals, and prayer-meetings were collected, we should have an-

[1] Cited in Lingard's *History of England*, vol. v., p. 261.

other ocean equal to the Atlantic; and if the curses and lies uttered about them were printed, the books that contained them would bridge it. In their presence, a bright halo of sanctity encircles the traditional Jesuit, and a ray of sunshine penetrates the dungeons of the Inquisition. St. Bartholomew's day alone can dispute with them their vicious pre-eminence.

While no apologist for them, we believe that they have done more harm in shutting the eyes of Protestants than in any other regard. Without self-knowledge there can be no reformation. This holds true not only of the individual but of the system. The individual who is wedded to a system should know that system, should look it squarely in the face, and anything that obstructs his view should be thrust aside. These few years have been a stumbling-block to this knowledge, and, hence it is, that multitudes of honest but weak-headed men and women regard their ancestors as solely the victims and not the perpetrators of wrong. "It is a prevalent opinion among us," says Rev. C. S. Henry, D.D., in a note to Guizot's lecture on the Reformation, "that the Romanists are the only ones who put people to death on account of their religious opinions. Protestants should know that this is not the case. So far from it, much sad warrant was given for the taunt of the Papists that the Reformers were only against burning when they were in fear of it themselves."

This blind credulity accounts, in a large measure, for their intolerance and hate despite the advancing spirit of justice and liberality. The cobwebs of prejudice, woven by falsehood, have sealed their eyelids, and instead of deploring the iniquities of their ancestors, they heap curses loud and strong on a reign whose alleged horrors were mild compared with the appalling catalogue which, to the disgrace of human nature, Protestant madness and rapacity have compiled. Cranmer, of whose heroic death we hear so much, was a traitor, a murderer, and a hypocrite, and would not have died at the stake if recantation would have saved his wicked life. So, too, of many others who fared similarly, and who have found a place in Fox's martyrology.

Mary passes away, and with her all hope of civil and religious freedom for the Catholic, until long after the consummation of the glorious Revolution from which ignorance dates the liberties of England. The day of the Episcopalian again dawns; and it is a long, terrible day—a day extending over three reigns, those of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I.

That Elizabeth should persecute Catholics—that she should employ the rack, the scavenger's daughter, the gauntlets, "little-ease," and other diabolical contrivances for their torture and degradation—that she should mutilate, behead, embowel, and burn—

that she should stop at nothing, however horrifying, for their apostasy or extirpation—is not at all surprising; but that she should use nearly the same weapons against the co-religionists of those whose ascendency on the continent her soldiers were periling their lives to secure, is a little puzzling to men who regard the Reformation, to use the fine phrase of Guizot, as "an insurrection of the human mind against the absolute power of the spiritual order."

It would appear, however, that the Genevan theology, while all right in France, was not to be tolerated in England; and the Puritans were made to partake of the chalice which they so madly persisted in pressing to the lips of Catholics. The inheritance of liberty which they derided when claimed by their Catholic fellow-countrymen, they now claimed for themselves, but in vain. The charter of John, and the magnificent securities thrown around it by the wisdom of parliaments and of courts, before the mental and moral running a-muck inaugurated by Henry's lechery, were sacrificed to the Moloch of statutory supremacy and infallibility. They had sowed the wind, and they were now compelled to reap the whirlwind. The *habeas corpus*, which was always a matter of right, was denied them, and they found trial by jury the merest mockery. The Court of Star Chamber, ever hostile to the jury, was in this reign a very bulwark against its freedom. "The control of this arbitrary tribunal," says Hallam, "bound down and rendered impotent all the minor jurisdictions. That primæval institution, those inquests of twelve true men, the unadulterated voice of the people, responsible alone to God and their conscience, which should have been heard in the sanctuaries of justice as fountains springing fresh from the lap of earth, became like waters constrained in their course by art, stagnant and impure."[1] To this despotism courts surrendered their independence, and the ermine of the judge was the badge, not of impartiality, but of rancorous prosecution. The administration of justice had become a farce, and parliament had sunk into deserved contempt for having allowed royal proclamations a footing with statutes. Elizabeth was practically the government, and friend as well as foe stood in terror of her. The following laconic letter, to one of her own bishops who resisted the spoliation of his revenues, will serve to illustrate her conduct towards her friends, and show that their fears were not groundless:

"PROUD PRELATE:

"You know what you were before I made you what you are: if you do not immediately comply with my request, by G——, I will unfrock you.

"ELIZABETH."

[1] *Constitutional History of England*, vol. i., p. 234.

Had she so desired, it would have been as easy for her to torture and execute him as to unfrock him.

James I., who succeeded Elizabeth, had more hate for Puritans than his predecessor, and less for Catholics, because, as he erroneously conceived, they were less hostile to the doctrine of divine right and passive obedience, but, as he truly conceived, less powerful. If the one placed any reliance on his assertions of devotion to the Scots' kirk, and the other on his promises of toleration, they were both very soon undeceived. To both he was alike faithless, and made them the victims and the sport of a power which he blasphemously ascribed to God. The Court of Star Chamber and royal proclamations were the servitors of his extraordinary claims.

That such a contemptible pedant and coward should have succeeded in governing arbitrarily, is the best evidence which can be adduced against those who wielded the sceptre of supremacy and infallibility before it passed into his hands. Had he less learning, and more common sense, he might have made a respectable figure on the throne in ordinary times; but, in Henry's place he could not stand at all, and in Elizabeth's he would be disposed of in short order. Fortunately for himself, and, perhaps, fortunately for England, he came after these sovereigns of iron, blood and consummate ability. His extravagant claims of power aroused the spirit of inquiry, and his weakness and pusillanimity emboldened the opposition who loudly demanded the freedom which the wisdom and valor of Catholics had made the birthright of all. True, the bold language of courts, and the vigorous protests of parliaments were often followed by cringing cowardice or persecution, but they had called into existence a power which, in the next reign, shattered the throne, and forever laid bare the monstrous sophisms by which it was upheld.

The nation, now disgusted and indignant, determined to demand its ancient rights and privileges, which, since the apostasy of Henry, were disregarded. It had tired of royal arrogance, insolence, usurpation, robbery, and murder. It longed for the reign of law, and its attitude, through its parliament, although at first moderate and even conciliatory, was such as to awaken the fears and the prudence of any monarch except one whose visionary importance had been fed until only the rudest shock could arouse him to a sense of his danger. The resistance of the people to the unconstitutional loan, their shout at Westminster, Middlesex, and Kent: "A parliament! a parliament! else no subsidies!" was met with impressment into the navy of the common people, and the incarceration of the gentry. The imprisonment of Darnel, Corbet, Earl, Heveningham, and Hampden, would be of little moment in the days of Elizabeth, but in the days of Charles I., it was a very

serious matter. Though Charles was successful in the *habeas corpus* proceedings that grew out of it, the interest those proceedings created, and the thorough and fearless sifting of constitutional principles to which they gave rise, cannot be overrated as a factor in the movement for liberty. The counsel who conducted these proceedings on the part of the defendants were eminently fitted for their work, both on account of their vast attainments as lawyers and their fearlessness in the discharge of duty. Seldon, whose fame as one of the great lights of the profession still lives, and Noy, yet justly renowned despite his apostasy, took leading parts, and poured a wealth of learning and of argument on the question, which, if heeded, would have won for their clients a righteous judgment, for their countrymen a proper recognition of their rights, and for their king a salutary fear of tampering with the liberties of the people, as the common law, the *Magna Charta*, and the various confirmatory statutes, had defined and established them.

The resolute and patriotic action of the next parliament was largely owing to the ignominious defeat of the *habeas corpus* proceedings. The Petition of Right might not have come so soon, had the defendants triumphed, but it now became an immediate and crying necessity. It was the first great effort of the nation, since the Reformation, to regain its shattered health, to rise from the bed of sickness and don the robes of convalescence. It was the first radiant beam from out the black and angry clouds that had hidden from view the scene of ancient liberty. It was the first faint gleam of the axe that crimsoned in the blood of Strafford, Laud, and Charles. It was the handwriting on the wall, but alas! unheeded, if read.

How true the saying, *Quos Deus vult perdere, prius dementat*, the course of Charles amply illustrates. Regardless of the power that compelled his assent to the Petition of Right, scarcely had the echo of that assent died away when he was again himself, the active embodiment of the foolish theories of his poor, pedantic and vanity-ridden father. The proroguing of parliament, caused by its remonstrance against the arbitrary exaction of tonnage and poundage, was followed by the arrest and imprisonment of those brave and true men who had the courage and patriotism to place themselves in the front of the opposition to the king's mad scheme of stifling the voice of the people, and of holding their liberties at will. The *habeas corpus*, which the Petition of Right was designed to doubly secure, was refused, and they were remanded to await the pleasure of Charles. Eliot died in the tower rather than submit to the degrading conditions imposed by the court for his release.

The judges were now his accomplices in crime, and although

sometimes disposed to assert their independence, they were, in the main, so timid or corrupt that we have no hesitancy in largely ascribing to them the tyranny that prevailed, the blood that afterwards deluged the land, and the sad fate of a monarch who inherited a despotism of which the people had grown weary, and of which they were gradually becoming determined to rid themselves at any cost. These judges, who could, if honest and resolute, have forced him to constitutional methods of government, aided him in every device to raise money by illegitimate means. Statutes and parchments were examined and obsolete practices of extortion revived. The statute *de militibus*, 1 Ed. II., was called into requisition, and one hundred thousand pounds were added to the royal exchequer. The forest laws were again put into operation, and fortunes vanished before them as mist before the morning sun. The ingenuity of Noy, now Attorney-General, but formerly the defender of popular rights, successfully evaded the statutes against monopolies, and a company with exclusive privileges of making soap started into existence on condition that it pay ten thousand pounds for its charter, and eight pounds for every ton of soap manufactured. Starch-makers secured similar privileges, and monopoly ruled and ruined in many other departments of industry. The ability and craft that inaugurated the reign of monopoly did not rest here. The busy brain of Noy was intent on formulating a scheme that would enable Charles to govern without parliamentary interference. The project was worthy of his keen intellect and persevering industry. His efforts were crowned with success. From ancient parchments, found in the Tower, he learned that seaports, maritime counties, and occasionally inland places, had been in early days required to furnish ships for the public service. This discovery was turned to account, and there was not wanting plausible warrant in the circumstances of the times for the revival of a practice which the condition of the country in a remote period might have justified. The scheme of Noy was perfected by Sir John Finch, Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, whose zeal in the service of his master compensated for his lack of learning and breadth of comprehension. The new scheme embraced not only the maritime towns and counties but the whole kingdom; and writs were accordingly directed to the sheriffs empowering them to assess every inhabitant subject to assessment, und to enforce payment by distress.

That the scheme worked well, is proved by the fact that the yearly supply therefrom was two hundred and eighteen thousand five hundred pounds; but that it was hazardous, and even dangerous, Charles fully realized, as is evidenced by his efforts to secure the opinions of the judges as to its legality, and the use he made of those opinions when secured.

If, however, he had hoped by this means to silence the voice of popular discontent, he was very soon undeceived. John Hampden, whose name will ever be sacred to freedom, who in 1626 refused to pay his assessment towards the forced loan lest the curse pronounced against the violators of the Magna Charta should fall on him, now came forward to be the victim or the hero of the nation's rights. His ostensible purpose was to test the legality of ship-money; his real purpose to arouse the people to a sense of their peril, and to nerve them to resistance. The amount of his ship-money, twenty shillings, was of no importance, but the principle it involved was of vital importance. It was repugnant to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution of his country, which had established that parliamentary consent was necessary to taxation, and he therefore felt that it was his duty, as a law-abiding citizen, to resist by all available just means its enforcement.

In the trial, his counsel, after showing how and in what manner the law had provided for the public safety, after adverting to the clause in the Charter of William the Conqueror that land shall be held free from unjust tallage, and to that of the Magna Charta that no aid or scutage should be assessed but by consent of the Great Council, they produced statute upon statute, passed in the days of the Plantagenets, asserting and enacting the exclusive right of parliament to impose taxes. The *Confirmatio Chartarum*, 25 E. 1, *De Tallagio non Concedendo*, and laws enacted under Edward III., were relied on. The conduct of the peers, and other great men, when convoked by the Privy Council in the reign of Richard II., at a time when the realm was threatened with invasion, was commented on. The fact disclosed, that though the danger of invasion was imminent, yet this distinguished assembly could do no more than loan its own money, and advise the speedy summoning of parliament, which, it claimed, was alone competent to provide a remedy. It was admitted by counsel for defendant that the voice of law could be silenced byextreme necessity, but it was denied and proven, that there existed any such necessity in the case before the court. Lastly, the Petition of Right was introduced and relied on as an insurmountable barrier to the tax in question.

Against such an array of statutes Noy's dusty explorations in the Tower were powerless. No legal defence of ship-money could be made, and it is but just to add, none was attempted. By the crown counsel and by the judges it was lifted out of the domain of law, out of the constitution, out of the pale of Christianity, and defended on barbaric and pagan principles—principles worthy of the lust that revived them, of the apostasy that propagated them, and that thrived and fattened on them.

To show their nature, we will offer a few passages from a law

dictionary published in the early part of the reign of James I. It was dedicated to Archbishop Bancroft, and was eulogized by the king, although he afterwards thought it expedient to suppress it by proclamation. Whatever its fate, James and Charles followed its teaching, and the judges in the case we are considering gave to it the sanction of their authority by making its doctrines the doctrine of the court. After our quotations from this dictionary, the work of Dr. Cowell, a man of learning and of eminence in the legal profession, we will offer some extracts from the decisions of the judges, so that our readers may see how close the resemblance between the condemned book and the court.

Under the title of "King," the law dictionary said: "He is above the law by his absolute power, and though, for the better and equal course in making laws, he do admit the three estates into council, yet this, in divers learned men's opinions, is not of constraint, but of his own benignity, or by reason of the promise made upon oath at the time of his coronation. And though at his coronation he take an oath not to alter the laws of the land, yet, this oath notwithstanding, he may alter or suspend any particular law that seemeth hurtful to the public estate. Thus much, in short, because I have heard some to be of opinion that the laws are above the king." Under the title of "Parliament," we find: "Of these two one must be true—either that the king is above the parliament, that is, the positive laws of his kingdom, or else that he is not an absolute king. And therefore, though it be a merciful policy, and also a politic mercy, not alterable without great peril, to make laws by the consent of the whole realm, because so no part shall have cause to complain of a partiality, yet simply to bind the prince to or by these laws were repugnant to the nature and constitution of an absolute monarchy." Under the title of "Prerogative" it is asserted, that "the king, by the custom of this kingdom, maketh no laws without the consent of the three estates, though he may quash any law concluded by them;" and that he "holds it incontrovertible that the king of England is an absolute king."[1]

That there is no difference between the doctrines of Dr. Cowell, which provoked the indignation of the House of Commons in the days of James, and the doctrines advanced by the judges in Hampden's case, the following extracts from their opinions will establish beyond question: "This imposition, without parliament," says Justice Crawley, "appertains to the king originally, and to the successor *ipso facto*, if he be a sovereign in right of his sovereignty from the crown. You cannot have a king without these royal

[1] Cited in Hallam's *Constitutional History of England*, vol. i., pp. 320, 321.

rights; no, not by act of parliament." "Where Mr. Holborne," says Justice Berkley, "supposed a fundamental policy in the creation of the frame of this kingdom, that, in case the monarch of England should be inclined to exact from his subjects at his pleasure, he should be restrained, for that he could have nothing from them but upon a common consent in parliament, he is utterly mistaken herein. The law knows no such king-yoking policy. The law is itself an old and trusty servant of the king's; it is his instrument or means which he useth to govern his people by; I never read nor heard that *lex* was *rex*, but it is common and most true that *rex* is *lex*." Justice Vernon's opinion was, "that the king, *pro bono publico*, may charge his subjects for the safety and defence of the kingdom, notwithstanding any act of parliament, and that a statute derogatory from the prerogative doth not bind the king; and the king may dispense with any law in case of necessity." Justice Finch, who gave a "vicious perfection" to the discoveries of Noy, held that, "no act of parliament could bar a king of his regality, as that no land should hold of him, or bar him of the allegiance of his subjects or the relative on his part, as trust and power to defend his people; therefore, acts of parliament to take away his royal power in the defence of his kingdom are void; they are void, acts of parliament to bind the king not to command the subjects, their persons, and goods, and I say their money, too; for no acts of parliament make any difference." To these opinions, opinions almost without a parallel in the history of judicial prostitution or judicial Dogberryism, we will add a passage from the speech of Attorney-General Banks, as it is a most emphatic declaration of the ideas then proclaimed regarding kingly power: "This power," he says, "is innate in the person of an absolute king, and in the persons of the kings of England. All magistracy it is of nature, and obedience and subjection it is of nature. This power is not anyways derived from the people, but reserved unto the king when positive laws first began. For the king of England, he is an absolute monarch; nothing can be given to an absolute prince but what is inherent in his person. He can do no wrong. He is the sole judge, and we ought not to question him."[1]

The crown, in spite of all that was so learnedly, eloquently, and moderately urged, obtained judgment, but the court was divided, five out of the twelve judges who composed it dissenting—some on technical grounds, and others against the prerogative without any qualification whatever. The case lasted six months, and during these six months every man's eye was riveted on the Exchequer-Chamber. Though the king carried the court, Hampden accom-

[1] Cited in Hallam's *Constitutional History of England*, vol. i., pp. 430, 431.

plished his purpose, and from that day forth the patriotic party interposed obstacles to the collection of the infamous tax, as it had now reason to regard it. Archbishop Laud writing to Lord Wentworth, bewails the decision of Justices Cooke and Hutton, who, he says "had both gone against the king very sourly," and enumerates as its effects the increased boldness of the opposition, the considerable decrease in the returns of ship-money, and the change in the sentiments of those who were previously reconciled to its imposition. "It is notoriously known," says Clarendon, the historian of the period, "that pressure was borne with much more cheerfulness before the judgment for the king than ever it was after."[1]

Notwithstanding the alarming manifestations of discontent in every county of the kingdom, Charles continued his arbitrary sway both by means of proclamations and iniquitous proceedings in the Star Chamber, means which his predecessors, from Henry down, had so effectively employed against the liberties of the people. For eleven years he resorted to every expedient to govern without a parliament; and when finally compelled by the exigencies of his war with the Scotch Covenanters to summon a parliament, he found it bitterly hostile, and disposed only to consider the foul tyrannies that characterized his rule. This parliament met on the 13th of April, 1640, and was dissolved in May of the same year, leaving Charles in a much sadder plight than before. Clarendon eulogizes the men who composed it, says they were sober, dispassionate, and good willed; but a glance at the names on its roll affords no warrant for his praise. It is asserted that some of its members had entered into negotiations with the Covenanters against the king, and that, as a result, Leslie had assumed the offensive and crossed the Tweed. It is not at all improbable that, had it not been dissolved so speedily, it would have gone to the lengths of the Long Parliament, which soon followed, and which, after many laudable acts, became more regardless of constitutional checks than the monarch whom it condemned, ending by completely trampling on the liberties it professed to save, placing the reins of power in the hands of a man of iron and blood—a fanatical hypocrite, who laughed at ancient guarantees, made a mock of popular assemblies, treated courts with contempt, and acknowledged no law save a will controlled by self.

Cromwell's treatment of that parliament, though without a shadow of legal warrant, and though the one he created to succeed it was a farce and a mockery, is, to our mind, the strongest point that can be urged to save him from a verdict of total de-

[1] Clarendon, p. 122.

pravity. Strange, most strange, that Lord Macaulay should prostitute the treasures of his gorgeous intellect, vast information, brilliant logic, and ravishing wealth of diction, by the defence of this parliament, even after it had unfurled the banner of revolt and given reins to the delirious, blasphemous, and bloody fanaticism of the country. Had he reserved some of the frenzied indignation which he so lavishly heaped on Charles, in his remarkable review of Hallam, for the Long Parliament, afterwards known as the rapacious and contemptible Rump, his fame as a historian would be enhanced though his vituperative powers of declamation might suffer. That parliament was the cause of the civil war, its miseries and horrors, and should be held to a strict accountability by every one who prizes truth. If any defence of Charles could be made, it furnished the best grounds for it. The change of masters was not for the better. The tyranny of one who had some qualities that command respect, was less odious than the tyranny of many who, by their nauseating cant and loud-mouthed hypocrisy made a laughing-stock of themselves and the English people. Judged by that parliament, the English people were not only bloodthirsty bigots but drivelling fanatics, who, in the name of heaven, were prepared to commit any folly, no matter how outrageous or ludicrous. Under it anarchy was supreme, preparing the way for the iron bonds that followed.

After this strange perversion of historical truth—a perversion that the admission of fallibility, made with an air of generous concession, does not redeem—we are not surprised to find the same entrancing writer extol Cromwell as a hero, a lover and benefactor of liberty. "No sovereign," he says, "ever carried to the throne so large portion of the best qualities of the middling orders, so strong a sympathy with the feelings and interests of his people."[1]

If, indeed, it be true that he was the embodiment of the best qualities of the middling orders, and that his sympathy and interest were as described, when the little or Barebones Parliament surrendered to him the power it derived solely from him, he very soon parted with them. But it is not true that he ever had them to carry them anywhere, and of this Lord Macaulay was fully aware. A more glaring and shameless falsehood was never penned—a falsehood that merits for its author the contempt of every man who values historical truth. What Cromwell was before, he was when he usurped supreme power, and what he was when he usurped supreme power he was to the end, namely, an enemy of his country, its laws and institutions, its traditions and religion—a despot, compared with whom Henry, Elizabeth, James, and Charles, shine with a radiance almost celestial.

[1] Macaulay's *Essays*, vol. i., p. 363.

"A bloody tyrant and a homicide;
One raised in blood, and one in blood establish'd."

"No hereditary despot," says Hallam, "proud in the crimes of a hundred ancestors, could more have spurned at every limitation than this soldier of a commonwealth."[1]

Again,—after telling how Cromwell had divided the kingdom into districts, placing at the head of each a major-general with almost unlimited powers, and with orders to collect a tax, imposed by himself, of ten per cent, from those who had in any way aided the king, and whose estate exceeded £100 per annum—Hallam, in language of truth and beauty says: "All illusion was now gone as to the pretended benefits of the civil war. It had ended in a despotism, compared to which all the illegal practices of former kings, all that had cost Charles his life and crown, appeared as dust in the balance. For what was ship-money, a general burden, by the side of the present decimation of a single class, whose offence had long been expiated by a composition and effaced by an act of indemnity? or, were the excessive punishments of the Star Chamber so odious as the capital executions inflicted without trial by peers, whenever it suited the usurper to erect his high court of justice? A sense of present evils not only excited a burning desire to live again under the ancient monarchy, but obliterated, especially in the new generation that had no distinct remembrance of them, the apprehension of its former abuses."[2]

Cromwell's death left the nation to be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, against which his feeble son Richard had neither the ability nor the disposition to struggle. All theories of government, and no government, had advocates and adherents. Royalists, fanatics, men of war and blood, planned and plotted. Wallingford House was arrayed against parliament, and, as a consequence, the Long or Rump Parliament was restored, and poor Richard was compelled to give up a position for which he was in every way unfitted.

A bastard republicanism was victorious, but impotent. The people, in whose recollection the iniquities of the Rump and the despotism of Cromwell inflicted in the name of republicanism, were still fresh, had no faith in its glittering promises. It was associated in their mind with the betrayal of sacred pledges, and the utter disregard of any and every right that stood in the way of its interest, caprice, or passion. Monk read the signs of the times, and the Restoration soon followed.

Twenty years of war and pillage, of anarchy and despotism, of

---

[1] *Constitutional History of England*, vol. ii., p. 22.
[2] *Constitutional History of England*, vol. ii., p. 20.

moral and political debasement, of hypocrisy and religious frenzy, had so disheartened and disgusted the nation that it almost unconditionally trusted its fate to Charles. This certainly was an error, for it was in a position to demand of him all the wise securities that it afterwards demanded of William of Orange, and he, undoubtedly, would accede more graciously than did the phlegmatic adventurer of the Hague, whose bigotry and ambition, and not his hatred of arbitrary rule, were the incentives of his invasion.

That there were constitutional barriers to any such demands, we are aware; but, it must be remembered, that this was a time when very little regard was paid to such barriers when they opposed tyranny. Why, then, should they be pleaded now, when by overleaping them the liberties of the people might be secured? True, Charles might not have considered himself bound by any promise made to usurped power; but, would he have dared to violate them? We think not. The legal objections, urged by Hallam against the demand of securities from Charles by the body that constituted a *de facto* government, were not more grave than those that could be urged against the convention that placed the Dutch bigot on the throne fettered by the Bill of Rights. The nation was back of that convention, and it would have been back of any securities of freedom required of Charles.

However, the Restoration proved a blessing. While it is true, that the ministry of Clarendon ended in his disgrace and exile—that that of the Cabal was profligate—that that of Danby was unscrupulous and bigoted—that that of Russell, Essex, and Shaftesbury, was impotent—the reign of Charles, whatever inconsiderate writers have asserted to the contrary, was favorable to liberty. It was the harbinger of those reforms which the arbitrary government of the Tudors, Stuarts, and Long Parliament, the anarchy of the Rump, the despotism of Cromwell, the anarchy and bastard republicanism of Richard, the revived Rump and the Committee of Safety had rendered necessary. His very vices conduced to this result. Had he not been indolent, and the slave of women, he might have attempted the rôle of his father. As it was, he was satisfied with plenty of money, and the society of his buffoons and mistresses. The smiles and caresses of Nelly Gwyn were more to his liking than schemes of absolutism. His degrading pleasures destroyed his ambition, and it was well for the nation that it was so, and perhaps equally well for himself. In his enfeebled condition of mind and body, he may have exaggerated the dangers attending any notorious departure of his government from constitutional limits, although they were unquestionably formidable thanks to the heroic efforts and sacrifices of the Eliots, the Seldons

and the Hampdens. The days of arbitrary rule had passed, and he had not, we believe, the disposition, conceding to him the ability, to revive them. The Star Chamber and the High Commission courts had ceased to exist, and could not be restored. Trial by jury, the great bulwark of ancient liberty, was less trammeled than at any time since the Reformation, the press was comparatively free, parliament independent, illegal taxation unknown, and the Habeas Corpus Act, to which the unwarranted detentions of Clarendon gave rise, passed into the statute book. There were some instances of illegal proclamations, and many of the denial of undoubted rights, but, on the whole, when we compare this reign to those that preceded it, we cannot but regard it as the convalescing stage in the terrible malady which had so long held the nation in its grasp.

Had James II. been a Protestant in religion and a Catholic in government, the patient would have glided rapidly from convalescence into the full enjoyment of health, purified by the ordeal, and pregnant with the wisdom begotten of suffering. He was, however, a Catholic in religion, whilst his conception of kingly power was derived, not from Bellarmine and Suarez, but from Parker and Laud.

If faithful to the promises made on his accession, his rule might have been prolonged; but they were hardly made when violated. Emboldened by the success of his proclamation levying duties on merchandise, and infatuated by hypocritical speeches of devotion, he entered on a course which would prove his ruin even were he of the national creed. Whatever were his ideas of royal power—and we have reason to say that they were nearly as outrageous as those of his grandfather—the great stumbling-block to his rule was his religion. As a Catholic, he could not continue long on the throne of England. His attempt at religious toleration aroused the bigotry of the country, and the birth of the Prince of Wales precipitated a fall which, in any event, was inevitable.

After three inglorious years, it ingloriously came; and the dragon's teeth, sown in the days of Henry, Edward and Elizabeth, were loosened. Liberty emerged from the clouds, not, indeed, in her pristine beauty, yet radiant with promise, glorified by suffering, the laurels of triumph on her brow, her eyes sparkling with hope, and her breast heaving with generous emotions, though the viper of religious intolerance still warmed within its folds. The Revolution was consummated, and the spirit of Langton and Pembroke rejoiced with that of Eliot and Hampden. The maxim, *A Deo rex, a rege lex*, was forever laid at rest, and many of the good old principles which, springing from the bosom of the Catholic Church found sanctuary in the bosom of the society of Anglo-Saxon and

Plantagenet times, were again revived—revived never more to be extinguished—revived to purify, to bless, to go on conquering and to conquer.

The Petition of Right, the early statutes of the Long Parliament, the Habeas Corpus, the Bill of Rights, complements to the ancient freedom which the early monarchs of the Reformation had destroyed, were henceforth to be barriers against the evil precedents so often, and most effectually, pleaded in opposition to the Constitution as established by Catholics.

The practices against which this wise legislation was levelled—the doctrines that it was to supplant—were peculiar to the Reformation, the very warp and woof of its composition, and had that event never happened, there would have been little need of it. Throughout all the long and terrible struggle which the claims and practices of the Reformation occasioned—claims and practices admitted by the most virulent enemies of the Catholic Church—the patriots, or perhaps to speak more accurately, the oppressed, insisted on the sufficiency of the laws of the realm as they existed before Henry's Bluebeardism developed. It was in their name the new forms of securities were demanded, the banner of revolt flung to the breeze, and William and Mary enthroned. From the reign of James I., when the struggle against absolute power in the temporal and spiritual order began to assume formidable proportions, they were as the pillar of fire to the Israelites in the desert. Whig and Tory, in the Convention of 1689, were agreed on their sufficiency. The Revolution may, therefore, be considered the restoration of ancient liberty, which was, as it were, held in abeyance during the long period of one hundred and fifty-four years.

That Catholics should be excluded from its benefits is a sad commentary on the spirit engendered by the Reformation—a spirit which even the demands of gratitude were powerless to check. With Protestant ascendency assured, it would have been the part of enlightened statesmanship to unshackle the limbs of those whose ancestors in the faith preserved the realm from the convulsions that afterwards shook some of the nations of Europe, made them the sport of every mad theory, the victims of every successful demagogue, because they had had no social state to serve as a beacon in the wild tempest of human passion.

But, in presence of its actual and prospective benefits—in presence of a past over which it was victorious, and of a future which it blessed, we do not find it congenial to question the legitimacy of its means, or to indulge in the language of crimination. That it partially triumphed over the Reformation, over its two distinctive doctrines—absolute power in the temporal and the spiritual order—and thus enabled the great mass of the people to live in compara-

tive peace and freedom, is, to our mind, sufficient to warrant the verdict, "Glorious," which Protestants have rendered—a verdict which we will not disturb by any complaints, however just. Glorious! though unworthy of the grand old pageantry with which it was crowned; glorious, though untrue to the grand old principles it revived; and glorious, though hostile to the grand old Church from which those principles sprung.

MICHAEL HENNESSEY.

THE LATELY RECOVERED APOCRYPHAL GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PETER.

DURING the winter 1886–1887 was found in a tomb at Akhmim, the ancient Panopolis, in Upper Egypt, a vellum MS. of thirty-three leaves, about six inches by four and three-quarters in size. This find was not communicated to the public till M. U. Bouriant edited the MS., in vol. i. fasc. ix. of the "Memoirs of the French Archæological Mission," a scientific institution which the French government keeps in Egypt. The vellum, now in the Ghizeh Museum at Cairo, dates, according to all appearances, from the ninth century of our era. It contains three books in a fragmentary state, the Book of Enoch in Greek (a most important acquisition, since till now we have known this Book only in its Ethiopic translation), the Gospel according to Peter, and an Apocalypse, identified for the present with the Apocalypse of Peter.

The speed with which the Gospel and the Apocalypse were republished as soon as they reached Europe, forms an amusing contrast with the previous seeming neglect of them. In the "Transactions of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences,"[1] Prof. Harnack edited both with Introductions. On the very day on which the "Memoirs" reached Cambridge, the text of the Gospel fragment was reprinted at the University Press under the editorship of Rev. H. B. Swete; three days later, on November 20th, a lecture upon the Gospel was delivered in the Hall of Christ's College, by Mr. J. A. Robinson. About the same time, Mr. Montague Rhodes James, fellow of King's College, lectured on the Apoca-

[1] Berlin, November 3, 1892.

lypse. Both of these lectures have been published by C. J. Clay and Sons, in a little volume containing also the text of both documents. The *Athenæum* for December 17, 1892, and the *Boston Commonwealth* for December 31st have issued interesting articles on the same subject, written by F. P. Badham and Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D.; Mr. J. Rendel Harris, now of Cambridge, England, has published a little volume entitled "The Newly Recovered Gospel of St. Peter," issued in New York by James Pott & Co.; J. O. F. Murray, in the *Expositor* for January, 1893, calls attention to the use of the newly recovered Gospel by Origen. Prof. Harnack has edited both Gospel and Apocalypse in Gebhardt and Harnack's "Texte und Untersuchungen," vol. ix., Heft ii.; Dr. Isaac H. Hall has a very instructive article on the Gospel in the *Biblical World* for February, 1893. The same writer has published an introduction to and a translation of the Apocalypse in the *New York Independent* for December, 1892. A very comprehensive article on the Gospel and a notice of the Apocalypse, both by Dr. Gasquet, appeared in the *London Tablet* for February 4, 1893, and a rather controversial notice against St. Justin's use of Pseudo-Peter by Father Herbert Lucas, S.J., may be seen in the *Tablet* of February 11th. By far the most thorough investigation on the Gospel of Peter has been written by Father Lucas and published in the *Month* of January, 1893. Expressing our obligations to the above writers, we think the time has come when the results of their investigations should be laid before the public.

We shall limit our remarks to the following points which are of the highest importance in the study of Peter's Gospel: 1. How can the newly discovered fragment be identified with the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter? 2. What is the age of the newly recovered Gospel according to Peter? 3. What practical bearing has the Gospel on the controversy concerning the authenticity of our Four Gospels?

I. What reason have we for identifying the recently discovered Apocryphal Gospel with that of Peter? The first ground for their identity is drawn from internal evidence. The Gospel is written in the first person, and pretends to be the account of an eye-witness. Again, the tone of the narrative demands that an important person, closely conected with Jesus, be the fictitious author. How else could we explain the words, "But I with my companions was grieved, and wounded in our understanding we hid ourselves; for we were sought for by them as malefactors, and as wishing to burn the Temple. . . ." Finally, the author openly calls himself Simon Peter. "But we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, wept and grieved, and each one grieving at what had happened, departed to his house. But I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother took

our nets and went away to the sea; and there was with us Levi the son of Alpheus whom the Lord. . . ." This is the end of the Gospel fragment. The author of the Gospel, therefore, wishes his production to be considered as the writing of St. Peter; in other words, the Gospel is an apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter.

These intrinsic arguments for the identity of the newly recovered Gospel and the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, are confirmed by a number of other considerations. The ancient references to the Gospel of Peter are very few in number. The book is mentioned by Origen,[1] Eusebius,[2] Jerome,[3] Theodoret,[4] and Serapion.[5]

But we do not learn much from these testimonies concerning the real character of the apocryphal Gospel. 1. Origen refers to it for the opinion that the brothers of Jesus were Joseph's sons by a first marriage. Since the recovered fragment of the Gospel begins only within the history of the Passion, we cannot verify Origen's reference. 2. Theodoret mentions the Gospel as being in use among the Nazarenes, "who honor Christ as a just man, and have made use of the so-called Gospel of St. Peter." Whatever may have been the body of the Nazarenes' religious tenets, it is not probable that they used Peter's Gospel as a sacred book. For we shall see that Pseudo-Peter is entirely anti-Judaic, while the Nazarenes were a Judaizing sect. Father Lucas is of opinion that Theodoret may have been in error here, as he is in other points concerning the apocryphal books. 3. Eusebius says that the Gospel of Peter was not used by Catholics, and 4. St Jerome places it among the apocryphal writings. Thus far, then, the testimonies are so vague that they leave us almost entirely ignorant of the doctrinal character of Peter's Gospel, except in so far as they point out its non-Catholic, and probably its heretical tendency.

More light will be thrown on our investigation by the letter which Serapion, bishop of Antioch (A.D. 190–203), wrote to the Church of Rhossus in Cilicia. "We receive both Peter and the other Apostles of Christ; but as experienced men, we reject the writing falsely inscribed with their names, since we know that we did not receive such from our fathers. Still, I allowed the book to be used, for when I visited you I supposed that all were attached to the right faith; and as I had not thoroughly examined the Gospel which they brought forward under the name of Peter, I said: If this is the only thing which seems to create petty jealousies among you, let it be read. But now, since I have learned from what has been told me that their mind was covertly attached to some heresy, I shall be anxious to come to you again;

---

[1] *Commentar. in Matt.* x. 17. [2] *H. E.*, iii., 3; iii. 25. [3] *De Viris Illustr.* i.
[4] *Haer. Fab.*, ii. 2. [5] *Cf.* Westcott, *Hist. Can. N. T.*, pp. 390, 391.

so brethren, expect me quickly. But we brethren, having comprehended the nature of the heresy which Marcianus held—how he contradicted himself from failing to understand what he said, you will learn from what has been written to you—were able to examine the book thoroughly having borrowed it from others who commonly use the very Gospel, that is from the successors of those who first sanctioned it, whom we call 'Docetæ' (for most of Marcianus's opinions belong to their teaching), and to find that the greater part of its contents agrees with the right doctrine of the Saviour, though some new injunctions are added in it which we have subjoined for your benefit."

The apocryphal Gospel of Peter, therefore, contained the heretical doctrine of the "Docetæ." Now, the lately recovered text, too, contains doctrines of a similar nature. We read, *e.g.*, "but he himself was silent, as having no pain," which fully agrees with the doctrine of the "Docetæ," that Christ did not suffer in the flesh. Then, again, instead of the words "My God, my God, why hast thou abandoned me?" the apocryphal Gospel reads: "My Power, my Power, thou hast forsaken me! (or hast thou forsaken me?) and thus saying, he himself also was taken up." This sentence is wholly "Docetic" in its bearing; it supposes that Jesus, either at the time of his baptism, or at any other period of his life, received a Divine Power, constituting him the Christ; this Power leaves the *human* Jesus during the passion and is taken up into heaven whence it had descended. Having recovered only the latter part of the Gospel, we cannot tell its exact tenets about Christ's birth and infancy, and least of all about the reality of the incarnation. But it is a most remarkable fact that the fragment avoids in the history of the passion all expressions which would imply any real pain on the part of Jesus Christ. The identity of the newly recovered apocryphal Gospel with Peter's Gospel rests therefore on solid arguments.

II. Our second question is concerned with the age of Peter's apocryphal Gospel. We must first distinguish between the age of the recently discovered vellum and the age of the Gospel written on it. The MS. has thus far been generally received as more recent than the 8th, but as older than the 12th century. For our present purpose the exact age of the vellum on which the fragment is written, and of the writing itself, is of little importance, while the age of the Gospel is of the greatest interest. The latter may be approximately settled from data furnished either by the text of the fragment or from extrinsic sources.

It is true that there are a few words and expressions in the Gospel which appear to require a date quite remote from Apostolic times. The Greek words σταυρίσκειν (the usual form is σταυρόω),

ἀπανιῶντες, σκελοκοπηθῇ, λαχμόν, and the phrase "Lord's Day" in the sense of "Sunday" point to an age later than that of the canonical Gospels. But, fortunately, the testimony of Serapion who wrote between 190 and 203 A.D., furnishes us a terminus after which Pseudo-Peter cannot have written. The same letter of Serapion shows that the holy bishop allowed Peter's Gospel to be read because, not being aware of the heresies it contained, he wished to avoid thereby the petty jealousies among his diocesans in Rhossus. It follows from this, that the Gospel's origin must antedate 190 A.D. considerably. If this were not the case, a learned bishop could hardly have allowed the Gospel to pass unchallenged in his diocese under the name of Peter.

Another fact from which the age of the Gospel may be inferred is the particular form of "Docetic" doctrine it contains. The first signs of this heresy we find in the writings of St. John: i. John, i., 1–3; iv., 1–3; ii. John, vii. After the Apostle's time, the controversy against the "Docetæ" was taken up by St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp.[1] The heresy was, therefore, from the first ages of the Church, important enough to call for a refutation from the pen of the most competent Christian controversialists. But the tenets of the sect, if sect it may be called—the "Docetæ" never constituted a separate sect, but were always united with other heretical bodies —were not always the same.

The "Docetic" doctrine, as such, has its root in the Gnostic theory, which regards matter as the seat of evil, so that an incarnation of the Son of God, in the proper sense of the word, is simply impossible. Hence, St. John had to insist on the reality of the incarnation; he assures his readers that he declares only what he has seen with his eyes, what he has heard, and what his hands have handled. There can be no question of a mere phantom underlying all this. Again, the Apostle insists on the fact that "every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God," while "every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God." The apostle evidently argues against a double array of adversaries: according to the former, Jesus has not come in the flesh; according to the latter, Jesus must be divided into a material body and a higher power which inhabits, as it were, the lower body and constitutes it the Christ.

The history of heresies in Apostolic times confirms our interpretation of St. John's words. Simon Magus represents the first class of the "Docetæ," maintaining as he does, that he himself is the Christ who has appeared as man among men, and has only apparently suffered on the cross.[2] Cerinthus represents the second

[1] Ign., ad Ephes., vii. 18.; ad Trall., 9–11; ad Smyrn., 1–7; Polyc. ad Philipp., c. 7.

[2] Iren., *Haer.* i., xxiii. 2.

class of "Docetæ," for, according to him, Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, while the Christ descended on Jesus after his baptism, in the form of a dove, and departed from Jesus at a later period. Jesus alone suffered and died, while the Christ remained impassible and spiritual.[1]

After the time of the Apostles, the principal representatives of the "Docetæ" are Saturninus (or Saturnilus), Cerdo, Marcion, Apelles, and Valentinus, all of whom advocate a modified form of Simon Magus's theory. According to Saturninus, the Redeemer has not been really born, is without body and form, and has only the appearance of a man.[2] Cerdo's doctrine resembles the system of Saturninus, while Marcion maintains that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, the Son of God suddenly appeared at Capharnaum in a "corpulentia putativa," without having passed through the body of the Blessed Virgin. Apelles ascribes to Jesus a sidereal body instead of a merely phenomenal one; in this body he enters the world without being really born.[3] Valentinus differs from his predecessor by assigning to Jesus a spiritual body, which he brings with him from heaven, and with which he passes through the Blessed Virgin, as water runs through a channel.[4] The Valentinians split afterwards into two parties—the eastern branch, represented by Axionicus and Bardesanes, adhered to the "Docetic" theory of Valentinus,[5] while the western division, under the leadership of Heracleon, Ptolemæus, and Marcus, passed over to the view which St. John branded as "dividing Christ." Jesus Christ, they said, was composed of four elements,—a purely spiritual element which he had received from Achamoth; a delicately organized psychical body, by means of which he became visible and perceptible to the senses without sharing in any way the grosser matter; the divine Soter or Redeemer was united to this Jesus Christ; and fourthly, before this union could be effected, the proper disposition had to be made in Christ's body.[6] Evidently, then, we have here a return to the view of Cerinthus, which divides Christ. The only doubt that might arise, concerns the fact whether those who adhered to this opinion were, at that late date, called "Docetæ"; but this, too, is certain from the writings of Tertullian.[7]

From Cerinthus down to the western branch of the Valentinians there is no vestige of a "Docetic" doctrine which divides Christ. Hippolytus,[8] indeed, represents Basilides as holding a

[1] Iren., *Haer.*, i. xxvi. 1; *cf.* Epiphan., *Haer.*, xxiii. 1.
[2] Iren., *Haer.*, i. xxiv. 2.
[3] Tertull. adv. Marcion, i. 19; iii. 11; *De Carne Christi.*, 6.
[4] Epiphan., *Haer.*, xxxi. 7.
[5] *Philosophumena*, vi. 35.
[6] Iren., *Haer.*, i., vii. 2.
[7] *De Carne Christi*, 15, 16.
[8] *Philos.*, vii. 14 *ff.*; *cf.* viii., 3; x. 12.

theory similar to the Cerinthian; but, on examination, we find that Basilides himself does not admit a proper indwelling of the divine element, and Irenæus testifies[1] that, according to Basilides, the divine νοῦς assumed only an apparent body, which he exchanged for the appearance of Simon of Cyrene before the crucifixion. According to Theodoretus, Tatian, too, was tainted with the heresy of the "Docetæ,"[2] but we are not told anything about the particular form under which he defended the doctrine. Clement of Alexandria[3] speaks of a Julius Cassianus as the author of the "Docetæ." St. Jerome[4] mentions a Cassianus, who taught the presence of a merely putative flesh in the person of Christ, and Theodoret[5] mentions a certain Kossianus among the disciples of Valentinus. But this Kossianus is either identical with the above Cassianus, or he did not live before 190 A.D., so that our present investigation is not affected by his "Docetic" teaching. Eusebius,[6] too, mentions "Docetæ," saying that they use the Gospel of Peter; they are, therefore, identical with the particular class which we are searching for. The "Docetæ" mentioned in the "Philosophumena"[7] hold the "Docetic" doctrine only in a modified form, so that their "Docetism" begins with the Resurrection only.

From all this it follows, that that the doctrine of the "Docetæ" explains the philosophical difficulty involved, according to their idea, in the incarnation of the Word in either of two ways—either the body of Jesus is a real body, and its union with the divine element is only apparent, as the union of an angel with its assumed body; or else, the union is real, and the body is only an apparent one, being either a mere phantom, or a body taken from the stars, or finally, a body brought down from heaven. Both of these explanations existed at the time of St. John; after his time, there is no trace of the former theory which admits the reality of Christ's body but denies the reality of its union with the Word, till we come to the development of the western Valentinians about the middle of the second century. On the other hand, it appears from the newly recovered fragment of Peter's Gospel, that Pseudo-Peter adhered to this explanation. How else are we to explain the cry of the crucified Jesus, "My Power, my Power! thou hast forsaken me! [or, hast thou forsaken me?]." The divine element which had assumed the human, was at that time evidently taken up into heaven whence it had descended.

A word must be said about certain considerations which appear to demand for Pseudo-Peter an earlier date than the middle of the

---

[1] *Haer.*, xxiv., 3–7.
[2] *Haer.*, fab. i. 20.
[3] *Strom.*, vii. 17, 108; iii. 13, 91.
[4] In ep. ad Gal., vi. 8.
[5] *Haer.*, fab. i. 8.
[6] *H. E.*, vi. 12.
[7] Viii. 2, 3, 8–12; x. 12, 16.

second century. 1. A modified form of the fragment's "Docetic" doctrine was taught by Basilides about 125 A.D. 2. F. P. Badham, in the *Athenæum*, of December 17th, maintains that the author of the apocryphal Vision of Isaias has made use of Peter's Gospel; now, Isaias's Vision is, by Dillmann and Dean, assigned to about 110 A.D. 3. Harnack, with a number of other critics, with whom Dr. J. R. Gasquet seems to agree,[1] maintains that St. Justin made use of the Gospel as one of the sources of the "Life of Our Lord," and that Pseudo-Peter must therefore be placed before 120 A.D. 4. According to J. R. Harris,[2] Peter's Gospel shows traces of following the harmony of Tatian.

To begin with Mr. Harris's opinion, we are sorry to say that his proof is by no means satisfactory. His method consists in comparing Peter's Gospel, not with Tatian, but with other writings—the doctrines of Addai, the Syriac Gospel of Cureton, Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's text—which he supposes to be a reproduction of Tatian's "Harmony." Besides this, Father Herbert Lucas[3] has shown, that in every single point in which Peter differs from our Gospels he differs also from Tatian. Finally, if Peter has used Tatian, he must have written after Tatian, and therefore about the middle of the second century.

To pass to another exception, no proof has as yet been given necessitating a dependence of Isaias's Vision on Peter's Gospel. If, however, such a dependence should ever be proved to exist, it surely would be the most welcome news which orthodox Bible students have received for years. For in that case, they would possess in Peter's Gospel a document reaching almost up to Apostolic times for the authenticity of the Four Gospels.

Against St. Justin's use of Pseudo-Peter Father Lucas[4] has put a very clear and strong argument, fully utilizing the knowledge which we thus far possess of the apocryphal Gospel. The argument contrasts the known discrepancies with the similarities existing between the Gospel and St. Justin:

I. Discrepancies:	II. Points of Contact:
1. Peter contradicts Justin and our Gospels three times (and once doubtfully).	1. Peter agrees with Justin and our Gospels, twice.
2. Peter omits facts related by Justin and our Gospels three times (and once doubtfully).	2. Justin agrees with Peter as against our Gospels, once.
3. Justin stands alone, his divergence from the Gospels being slight, once.	

Summing up the result, we obtain three points of contact against

[1] *London Tablet*, of February 4 and 18, 1893. [2] P. 53.
[3] *Month* of January, 1893, p. 13. [4] *London Tablet*, February 11, 1893, p. 216.

eight (and two doubtful) discrepancies between Justin and Peter. Two of these points of contact are readily explained, since in them both Peter and Justin agree with our Gospels; the third instance in which Peter and Justin agree as against the Gospels is more satisfactorily accounted for by the assumption that both followed a common third source, distinct from the Gospels (the Acta Pilati, for instance), than that Justin followed Peter here, though he differs from him in eight (and in two doubtful) cases. Dr. Gasquet's answer[1] is, on the whole, a mere repetition of his previous statement. Of the four agreements between Peter and Justin, mentioned by Dr. Gasquet, three are readily explained by a recourse to our Four Gospels, and the fourth is the passage in which both Peter and Justin have probably used the Acta Pilati.

The exception that Basilides's doctrine nearly agrees with the form of "Docetism" implied in Peter's Gospel, has been implicitly answered when we showed that the Philosophumena do not clearly state this fact. It must also be remembered that other conditions involved in the history of Peter's Gospel do not permit us to place its composition in the time of Basilides.

a. Serapion professes to have borrowed the Gospel from the successors of those who introduced it into the Church. But this he could not have done, had it been introduced by Basilides, who lived almost seventy years before Serapion.

b. Very little is known of Basilides and his history. It seems that he was an Alexandrian, and probably of Jewish descent. He is said to have lived "not long after the times of the Apostles" and to have been a younger contemporary of Cerinthus, and a follower of Menander, who was himself the successor of Simon Magus.[2] It is certain from all these details that at Basilides's time the "Docetæ" belonged still to the Judaizing party in the Church. A glance at Peter's Gospel suffices to convince us that it has not been written by a Judaizing author, nor for a Judaizing circle of readers. According to the Gospel the Jews are the princip l authors of the crucifixion. None of the Jews are able to wash their hands, though they desire to follow Pilate's example. Herod orders our Lord's execution, and on him devolves the responsibility for Christ's death. Joseph of Arimathea begs the body of Jesus from Pilate who is fully willing to give it, but must beg it, in his turn, from Herod; Herod is throughout represented as Pilate's superior. One of the crucified thieves reproaches the Jews for their treatment of Jesus, and the Jews barbarously desire, on their part, that his legs may not be broken, so that he may die in greater agony. All these considerations are so many proofs for the anti-Judaizing tendency of Pseudo-Peter.

[1] *Tablet*, February 18, 1893, p. 255.

[2] Westcott, *Can. N. T.*, p. 293.

c. Again, Serapion says that Peter's Gospel contains the heresy which Marcianus held. Marcion cannot be meant by this Marcianus, since he did not hold the form of "Docetism" which is contained in Peter's Gospel. All probability points to Marcus as being the Marcianus mentioned by Serapion. For of Marcus, Irenaeus writes: "The Marcosians introduce with subtlety an unspeakable multitude of apocryphal and spurious writings which they themselves forged to confound the foolish, and those who know not the Scriptures of truth."[1] Adding to this that Marcus agrees in his "Docetic" doctrine with Peter's Gospel, we are warranted in maintaining that the Marcosians were the authors of Peter's Gospel.

d. This inference is rendered still more probable by the fact that Marcus is said to have been of Syrian birth, because he used in his writings Aramaic liturgical forms.[2] For the apocryphal Peter too uses Aramaic liturgical forms, as is readily perceived on a careful perusal of the Gospel. "Then the Jews," the Gospel reads, "and the elders and the priests, when they saw what an evil deed they had done to themselves, began to beat their breasts and to say, Woe to our sins, for the judgment and the end of Jerusalem is at hand." In our Four Gospels we seek in vain for these words, but they are almost verbatim contained in Syrian sources. The doctrine of Addai reads: "Unless those who crucified him had known that he was the son of God, they would not have had to proclaim the desolation of their city, nor would they have brought down woe upon themselves." The Cureton Syriac reads: "And all those who were assembled there, and saw that which was done, were smiting upon their breast and saying, Woe to us, what is this! Woe to us for our sins!"[3] It may be of interest to know that the old Latin Codex of St. Germain which contains a very early text of Matthew's Gospel, had a similar reading: "Woe unto us, the things which are done to-day are done for our sins; for the desolation of Jerusalem hath drawn nigh" [Vae nobis, quae facta sunt hodie propter peccata nostra; propinquavit enim desolatio Hierusalem].

Another instance of Peter's approach to the Syrian liturgy we find in his story of the Resurrection: "They see go out from the sepulchre three men, and the two holding upright the one, and a cross following them. . . . . And they heard a voice out of the heavens, saying, 'didst thou preach obedience to them that are asleep?' And an answer was heard from the cross, 'Yea.'" The cross following the three coming out of the sepulchre reminds one of the passage in the Syriac-Antiochene liturgy for the feast of the Holy Cross:

[1] *Haer.*, i. xx. 21. [2] Iren. *Haer.*, i. xxi. 3. [3] Luk. xxiii. 47.

"Thou didst ride the cross when thou wentest forth to bruise the armies of the powers."

As it is therefore certain, on the one hand, that Peter's Gospel was not written after 190 A.D., so it is most probable, on the other hand, that it was written by Marcus or his followers about the middle of the second century.

III. The third question which we wish to touch upon, is concerned with the practical bearing of Peter's Gospel on Christian Apologetics. The first fact, of the greatest importance in this respect, consists in Pseudo-Peter's use of the Four Gospels. John, xix. 2, 13, 16, 24, 31, 41; xx. 5, 10; xxi. 3; Luke, xxiii. 7, 32, 39, 44, 45, 47, 50, 54; xxiv. 1, 4; Mark, ii. 14; xv. 19, 32, 33, 38, 39, 42, 45, 46; xvi. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8; Matt., xxvii. 24, 30, 44, 45, 51, 54, 57, 60, 64, 66; xxviii. 1, 5, 6, 8, will be recognized without much difficulty in the text of the Gospel.

". . . . But no one of the Jews washed his hands, neither did Herod, nor any one of his judges, nor even of those who wished to wash them. Pilate rose up, and thereupon Herod, the king, orders that the Lord should be taken away, saying to them: What I have commanded you to do, do ye with him.

"And Joseph, the friend of Pilate and of the Lord, had come thither, and knowing that they were about to crucify him, he came to Pilate and begged the body of the Lord for burial. . . . . And Pilate sent to Herod and asked for his body. And Herod said: Brother Pilate, even if no one had asked for him, we should have buried him, since the Sabbath is drawing nigh. For it is written in the Law that the sun must not go down upon one that has been murdered, on the day before their feast, the feast of the unleavened bread.

"But they, having taken the Lord, pushed him as they ran, and said: Let us drag away the son of God, since we have him in our power. And they clothed him with purple, and seated him upon the judgment-seat, saying: O, king of Israel, judge righteously. And one of them brought a crown of thorns and set it upon the Lord's head.

"And others standing by, spat in his face (eyes?), and others struck his cheeks; others pricked him with a reed, and some scourged him, saying: Let us honor with such honor the son of God.

"And they brought two evil-doers, and crucified the Lord between them. But he himself was silent as having no pain. And when they set up the cross, they wrote upon it: This is the king of Israel. And having laid down his garments before him, they divided them, and cast lots for them.

"And one of those malefactors upbraided them, saying: We

have suffered thus by reason of the evil deeds which we did, but this one, having come as Saviour of men, wherein has he offended? And incensed against him, they commanded that his legs should not be broken, in order that he might die in torment.

"And it was mid-day, and darkness covered all Judea; and they were disturbed and in trouble lest the sun should go down while he was still alive; for it is written for them that the sun shall not go down upon one that has been murdered. And one of them said: Let us give him gall mingled with vinegar to drink. And they brought all to its fulfilment, and filled up the measure of sins upon their own heads. And many walked about with lanterns, thinking that it was night, and some stumbled. And the Lord cried out, saying: My Power, my Power, thou hast forsaken me! (or, hast thou forsaken me?) and thus saying, he himself also was taken up (or, and when he [the Lord] said thus, he [the Power] was also taken up).

"And at the ninth hour the veil of the Temple of Jerusalem was rent in twain. And then they drew out the nails from the hands of the Lord, and laid him on the earth. And the whole earth quaked, and there arose great fear. Then the sun shone out, and it was found to be the ninth hour. But the Jews rejoiced greatly, and they gave the body to Joseph to bury, as it had been observed how many good deeds he had done. And he took the Lord, and washed him and wrapped him in fine linen, and brought him into his own sepulchre, which was called Joseph's Garden.

"Then the Jews and the elders and the priests, seeing what an evil deed they had done to themselves, began to beat their breasts and to say: Woe for our sins, for the judgment is at hand, and the end of Jerusalem.

"And I, with my companions, was grieving, and, being wounded in heart, we hid ourselves, for we were sought for by them as malefactors and as wishing to burn the Temple. And besides all these things, we were fasting and sitting down and weeping, night and day, until the Sabbath.

"But the scribes and Pharisees and elders were gathered together with one another, for—having heard that the whole people are murmuring and beating their breasts and saying: If such mighty things are done at his death, see how righteous a man he is,—the elders were afraid and came to Pilate begging him and saying: 'Give us soldiers that we may guard his sepulchre for three days, lest his disciples come and steal him away, and the people suppose that he is risen from the dead, and harm us.' And Pilate gave to them Petronius the centurion with soldiers to keep the sepulchre. And with them came elders and scribes to the tomb, and they, with the centurion and the soldiers, all those who were there to-

gether, rolling a great stone, laid it upon the door of the sepulchre, and upon it they plastered seven seals, and pitched a tent there, and kept guard.

"And as the Sabbath was dawning, early in the morning, there came a crowd from Jerusalem and the surrounding country to see the sepulchre which had been sealed.

"But in the night in which the Lord's day was drawing on, as the soldiers were on guard, two by two, according to their watch, there came a great voice in heaven, and they saw the heavens opened and two men descending thence, with great radiance and standing at the sepulchre. And that stone, which had been placed upon the door, rolled away of itself, and withdrew to one side, and the sepulchre was opened and both the young men went in.

"The soldiers seeing this, awoke the centurion and the elders, for they also were present keeping guard; and when they had related what they had seen, again they see go out from the sepulchre three men, and two of them holding upright the one, and a cross following them; and the heads of the two were reaching to heaven, but the hand of him that was held upright by them extended above the heavens. And they heard a voice out of the heavens, saying: 'Didst thou preach (obedience) to them that are asleep?' And an answer was heard from the cross, 'Yea.'

"They (the watchers) then deliberated one with another to go away and show these things to Pilate. And while they yet consider the matter, the heavens appear again open, and a certain man descending went into the sepulchre. When they saw these things, the centurion and those who were with him hastened by night to Pilate, leaving the sepulchre which they were guarding, and they related all they had seen, in great anxiety, saying: 'Truly he was a son of God.' And Pilate answering said to them: 'I am pure of the blood of the son of God; but this seemed best to you.' Then all drew near and entreated him and besought him to command the centurion and the soldiers to say nothing of what they had seen. For it is better for us, they said, to be guilty of the greatest sin in the sight of God than to fall into the hands of the people of the Jews and be stoned. Therefore Pilate ordered the centurion and the soldiers to say nothing.

"And at the dawn of the Lord's day, Mary Magdalene, a disciple of the Lord, who, afraid of the Jews because they were inflamed by anger, did not at the sepulchre as women were wont to do over the dead and those that were beloved by them, taking her friends with her, came to the sepulchre where he was laid. And they feared lest the Jews should see them, and they said: 'Though we were not able to weep and to wail in that day in which he was crucified, yet now at his sepulchre we may do so. But who will

roll away for us the stone that was laid at the door of the sepulchre, so that we may enter in, and sit down beside him, and do what is due? For the stone was great, and we fear lest some one may see us. And if we be not able, we may cast down at the door what we are bringing in remembrance of him, and weep and wail until we come to our own house.'

"And going on, they found the sepulchre opened, and drawing near, they stooped down there, and they see there a young man sitting in the midst of the sepulchre, beautiful, and clothed with a most brilliant robe, who said to them: 'Why have you come? Whom do you seek? Is it the one who was crucified? He is risen and gone away; and if you do not believe, stoop down, and see the place where he lay, that he is not there; for he has risen and gone away to the place whence he was sent.'

"Then the women were afraid and fled.

"And it was the last day of the unleavened bread, and many went (out from the city) to their homes as the feast was ended. But we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, wept and grieved, and each one grieving at what had happened went to his house. But I, Simon Peter, and my brother Andrew, took our nets and went away to the sea; and there was with us, Levi, the son of Alpheus, whom the Lord . . ."

If Pseudo-Peter had written this Gospel about 120 A.D., as Harnack and others maintain—not all of them from pure zeal for the defence of the Four Gospels—the recently discovered MS. would contain the earliest written document attesting the authenticity of our Gospels. But, in point of fact, Peter's Gospel is not as old as Tatian's "Diatessaron," and cannot claim such a strong inferential value as the latter work. For while Peter cites single passages of the Gospels, Tatian harmonizes the canonical Gospels bodily, so as to form one continuous whole out of them. Our reader well remembers that a few years ago the actual "Diatessaron" of Tatian was recovered, and published in Rome by Ciasca on the occasion of our Holy Father's jubilee.[1] Such rhapsodies as appeared in the *Boston Commonwealth*[2] are, therefore, entirely out of place. "Half a century of discussion," the writer said, "is swept away by the recent discovery at a stroke. Brief as the recovered fragment is, it attests indubitably all four of our canonical books."

To avoid misunderstanding, we must again guard our reader against the belief that Harnack and his followers date Pseudo-Peter back to about 120 A.D., out of regard for the authenticity of our Four Gospels. They are rather intent on showing that Peter cannot have used John's Gospel, but that either John used Peter's,

[1] Tatiani, *Evangeliorum Harmoniæ Arabicæ* . . . . 1888.
[2] December 31, 1892.

or both used a common third one. Thus, they wish to destroy the value of Peter's Gospel in the Johannine controversy. Again, since Peter does not mention any apparitions after the Resurrection, the above critics maintain that the story of the apparitions in our four Gospels is nothing but a later addition from legendary sources, the earliest Christian records being wholly without such miraculous reports.

But the more modest claims of Peter's Gospel may be asserted with the greatest emphasis. It has been the boast of the Tübingen school, especially, that our Four Gospels are, partially at least, nothing but "Tendenz-Schriften," or "tendency-writings." Now, Peter's Gospel shows us what a real "tendency-writing" is like. "Not more evidently does the sun surpass the moon in brightness than do our four Gospels excel in glory this imitation of them," are the words of the writer in the *Boston Commonwealth*

Another point, equally direct against our modern critics, is the equality with which Pseudo-Peter treats the four Gospels. "He uses and misuses each of them in turn," says Mr. Robinson. "To him they all stand on an equal footing. He lends no support to the attempt which has been made to place a gulf of separation between the fourth Gospel and the rest, as regards the period or the area of their acceptance as canonical." How many and serious attacks on the fourth Gospel have been made of late by the different classes of Bible critics, is a matter too well known to my readers to need further explanation. But in this point, too, Tatian's "Diatessaron" surpasses Peter's Gospel in evidential value.

A third point, which has been satisfactorily settled by the recovery of Peter and Tatian, has been well explained by Father Lucas in the *Month* of January. The author of "Supernatural Religion" had identified the Gospel according to the Hebrews with Tatian's "Harmony," and with the Gospel of Peter. "The Gospel according to the Hebrews," and "the Gospel according to Peter," were, according to that plausible writer, "substantially the same work." Again, no one "had seen Tatian's 'Harmony,' probably for the very simple reason that there was no such work, and the real Gospel used by him was that according to the Hebrews."[1] Truly, a more thorough answer could not have been given to the above author, even by his deadly enemy, than has been furnished by the Nemesis of history. Both Peter and Tatian were recovered almost immediately after the writer had flung his bold theory before the reading public, and Peter and Tatian are not only distinct from each other, but both differ, too, from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

---

[1] *Supernatural Religion*, sixth edition, i., 420; ii., 159 *f.*

These, then, are the results of our investigation: 1. The MS. found in the tomb at Akhmim contains a fragment of the apocryphal Gospel according to Peter. 2. The Gospel according to Peter was written about the middle of the second century. 3. Though the newly-recovered text of Peter's Gospel does not yield as weighty an argument for the authenticity of our four Gospels, as is afforded by Tatian's newly-recovered "Diatessaron," it furnishes at least another incontestable proof that the four Gospels enjoyed, as early as the middle of the second century, that peculiar authority for which they have been noted in all ages of the Church, and that the recent theories of the Bible-critics find as little support in the actuality of the past as they have in the scientific researches of the present. May we then expect universal peace in the hostile camp of the Rationalistic critics after the treasures of the tomb at Akhmim have been brought to light? We fear the words spoken by the God Incarnate are true, even in our days: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe, if one rise again from the dead."

A. J. Maas, S. J.

THE LATE ARCHBISHOP ULLATHORNE.

IT is to be regretted that, as each generation passes by, the highest types of that generation become extinct. It is not only the men themselves who become extinct, but their types which were the products of their surroundings. Take the ecclesiastics of the present century, whether Catholic priests or Protestant ministers; and compare the types of say 1830, or 1850, with those of the last dozen or twenty years. Speaking roughly we may say that Catholic emancipation changed the public presentation of priestly life as much as Ritualism changed the style and guise of parsons As long as priests were under the ban of penal laws, and compelled to dress like country farmers to avoid indignities, their "presentation" had no relation to their divine office; and as long as parsons were only "ministers," but not "priests," their "presentation" was that of educated, refined laymen. Hence the passing away of soon-to-be-forgotten types; those of the priests who were forced to hide their priestly character, and those of the parsons, who made no pretension to be priests.

"I received the order of priesthood on the Ember Saturday of September, 1831," wrote the late Archbishop Ullathorne in his "Autobiography." That would be nearly sixty-two years ago. Only sixty-two years ago! Yet we do not imagine that in any like period of any age—bar only the age of madness, called the Reformation—there was ever such a revolution in priestly life. "Mr. William Ullathorne" was then at Downside or at Prior Park; and the very thought of an English Catholic College at that period is the suggestion of Catholic penalties and humiliations. Who that has read the story of Downside or of Stonyhurst, of Ushaw, Crook Hall, or Old Hall Green—the last being the offspring of Douay and of St. Omer; of Sedgley Park—whose greatest pupil was John Milner; or of Oscott, whose founder was that same John Milner, the ever to be venerated bishop and author; could have failed to grasp the meaning of that isolation which English Catholics converted into a triumph? Archbishop Ullathorne knew the English colleges at a period when they were just emerging out of the persecutions of the penal laws, and the still greater persecutions of Protestant bigots. He was therefore a link between the fierce past and peaceful present. He knew all about "glorious Douay" the ancestor of nearly all the English colleges, the home of English exiles, of future martyrs; he had been brought up in a

country town where the only dogma of all his acquaintances was "No Popery, no Papists, no Mass;" so that, in after life, he could measure the value of his comparative peace by the recollection of the social bitterness of his youth. And being always of noble nature, firm, manly and irreproachable, he was selected by Pope Pius IX. to be the first Bishop of Birmingham; less for his capacity—which was admitted by every one to be adequate—than for his grand outline of character, which was typical.

What may be called the history of Dr. Ullathorne is also naturally the past history of English Catholicism, from about 1815 to about 1890. No one knew that history better than Dr. Ullathorne. He had lived through the twenty years which were antecedent to emancipation; when the fierce fights in the House of Commons, and in the whole country, breathed the spirit of the three centuried hatred of the Catholic faith. He remembered the time when the bells of some Protestant churches were tolled, to signify the death-knell of Protestant liberties; Catholic emancipation being regarded as "the forerunner of Papal interdicts, and the rekindling of the fires of Smithfield." When the Hierarchy was restored, he wrote an admirable book, to try to prove to members of Parliament that the Pope meant no discourtesy to the queen or to her bishops or to her Privy Council; since before "the Hierarchy was re established every possible precaution had been taken by the Holy See to avoid giving offence to the government and the people of England;" and he entered into the most minute particulars of every step in the negotiation as between the Vicars Apostolic and the Holy See. It may be well perhaps at this point to give an outline of the reasoning by which he sought to convince Englishmen of Catholic loyalty.

A hundred years before the time of Catholic emancipation Pope Benedict XIV. had drawn up the constitution by which the Catholic Church in England was to be regulated. But, as Dr. Ullathorne argued, the time of Benedict XIV. was the time of penal laws against English Catholics; it was the time when liberty of conscience was denied to them; it was the time when they had to be educated beyond the seas, and when the religious orders had not a single house in England; when even parochial divisions were not permitted; and when the very few places of Catholic worship were mostly chapels in noblemen's houses, or such barns or lofts as might offer secure hiding-places. This had been the case for three long centuries. But now,—argued Dr. Ullathorne with obvious truthfulness (and we are giving only the substance of his ingenuous pleading) the penal laws have been removed from the statute book. There is at least the legality of a perfect freedom of Catholic action. Catholics have already increased in

numbers, and they are building churches and schools all over the country; so that the only thing that is wanting is the ordinary government of a Catholic province, and therefore of the power of legislating in a Provincial Synod. Moreover, argued Dr. Ullathorne, the Church in America has obtained its Hierarchy; Australia and the West Indies have been equally privileged; is it not monstrous, then, that England should be singled out for privations which were only consistent under the odious reign of penal laws?

But there were other points, equally significant to the legislature. From the days of the distinguished minister, Mr. Pitt, English statesmen had frequently affirmed that Catholic Vicars Apostolic were not conformable to British ideas. They had suggested that there should be Catholic bishops in ordinary. And though they did not realize the full meaning of a Hierarchy, nor "the arrogant assumption of a Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster," they approved of the institution, "a Catholic Episcopate." Now all this was well known at Rome. For many years there had been discussion on the question, "was it wise and prudent to restore the Hierarchy in England?" and at last Monsignor Barnabo, well knowing the Pontiff's mind, said to Bishops Wiseman and Sharples, who were consulting with him in Rome about their troubles, "You will always have trouble till you ask for a Hierarchy; ask for it, and I will support you." Very soon afterwards the English Vicars Apostolic received a letter from the Holy Father with this instruction, that they should divide their eight vicariates into twelve bishoprics; and in 1847 the scheme was drawn up, and was ready for presentation to the Pontiff. It was decided that Dr. Ullathorne should be the bearer; and in May, 1848, he started for Rome; being the first emissary in regard to the new Hierarchy.

Dr. Ullathorne did not write much in his letters nor in his autobiography on the subject of the "Restoration of the Hierarchy"; yet what he did write was well worth remembering. English Catholics in these days, who have not passed life's meridian, can scarcely figure the "furious heat," as Dr. Ullathorne called it, of the whole nation on the subject of the "Usurpation." When Dr. Ullathorne wrote (in 1850) "the whole country is in a boil on the subject"; and again (in 1851), just after the passing of the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill," "A few bishops will have to go once into jail, and the whole matter will be ended"; and again, in the same year, "the *Times* gave me a thundering article when noticing my letters to Lord John, and called me 'a man of the most astounding impudence'"; all such comparatively mild expressions fail to convey a just idea of the national ferment, intoxication and delirium. The present writer well remembers how men of brains and education were so carried away by the popular shout of "papal

aggression," that nothing else was talked of, or thought of, or written about, for certainly a month or six weeks. No Protestant kept his head during that crisis. From Lord John Russell, who penned a firebrand to the Bishop of Durham, prophesying the total destruction of English liberties, to the least educated of the street orators or the tavern brawlers, there was no one who had the common sense to ridicule the "storm in the tea-cup," which was soon to be followed by the repeal of the Titles Bill. When the storm was all over, it is due to Englishmen to admit frankly that they did their best to make amends by their courtesy; while, as to Lord John Russel, even the comic paper, *Punch*, was unable to resist the temptation of describing him as "the naughty boy who chalked up 'No Popery,' and then ran away."

The no popery scare had, however, left its traces; and in the year following the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill another bill was introduced to obtain the government inspection of Catholic convents. It was offensively alleged in the preamble of the bill that "it was expedient to make provision for preventing the forcible detention of females in houses wherein persons were bound by monastic vows." Bishop Ullathorne responded in a vigorous pamphlet entitled "A Plea for the Rights and Liberties of Religious Women"; and this appeal to the manliness of the British public caused the bill to be relegated to the waste-paper basket. A second movement, however, in hostility to Catholic convents was inaugurated by the too valiant Mr. Chambers, the agent of the Evangelical and Protestant Alliance. Bishop Ullathorne had no fear as to the result, and the request made in Parliament for a committee of inquiry was only followed by some desultory conversation.

It may be well to keep to more or less historic events with which Bishop Ullathorne was connected before we proceed to think of him, as it were, personally, or with reference to his very winning characteristics.

Let us glance then at the period of the promulgation of two dogmas—those of the Immaculate Conception and Infallibility. When the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was being discussed in Council, Dr. Ullathorne was rejoiced when "the voice of the theologians was corrected by the voice of the Bishops." He believed in spiritual authority more than in reason. As he expressed it in a private letter to an intimate friend, "I am delighted to see the Bishops capsizing the theologians." "The Bishops are all authority and the theologians all reason." And when the welcome telegram reached him, "The Pope officiating at St. Peter's, after the Gospel at 11 o'clock, promulgated the expected decree; the Immaculate Conception is declared of faith, and whoever denies it is a heretic; two hundred Bishops present; Rome drunk

with joy." Bishop Ullathorne wrote to a friend: "It is curious, that so long as the Immaculate Conception was believed, received, and preached with a simple, unreasoning faith, as it always was in the East, there was no difficulty about it. The moment reason touched it, it became obscured and darkened, and the language of divines got perplexed; and it has taken six centuries to get back from reasoning to faith, and for the wisdom of man to get back to the foolishness of faith."

The Bishop wrote in the same spirit of the dogma of Infallibility; and perhaps it may be interesting to dwell for a moment on his letters written from Rome during the time when the Vatican Council was being held. Having left England in November, 1869, he remained in Rome until July, 1870; and his letters during the eight months breathe a very tender perception of whatever was Roman in the best sense. Naturally, he was "full" of the Vatican Council. There was probably no exaggeration in the following sentence: "Such an assemblage of Prelates as was seen at the Vatican Council, whether you consider numbers or the character of their training and breadth of experience, was never witnessed in this world before." We follow him, with almost a sense of being present, as he pictures the eight tiers of Prelates, with their silver copes and pure linen mitres; some six hundred Bishops, besides the cardinals, ranging from the two sides of the apse, with ten Patriarchs, and numerous Abbots and Generals of Orders, in their places of precedence or degree. Bishop Ullathorne's place in the Synod, as he described it in one of his letters, was "in the third row from the top, having the Primates and Archbishops at his back, and the number on his seat was 275, the numbers going from 1 to about 700."

The many comments or reflections of the Bishop, on both the work and the spirit of the Council, were so excellent that it would be a treat to transcribe all. It must suffice, however, that we say that there is probably no publication which more profoundly yet more agreeably describes the council. And equal praise must be bestowed on the Bishop's letters on Roman treasures—treasures such as Catholics alone can love and value. His account of some of the relics is very touching. The Holy Crib and the Holy Cross moved the Bishop so deeply that he makes us feel with him as he gives expression to his emotion. "These are the great things of Rome—greater than the Colliseum, greater than St. Peter's even, for they will shine in heaven at the last day when the rude works of men have perished." . . . . "Keep, then, to the rude Crib, keep to the rude Cross, that sweetens the water of salvation, that you may be known to belong to Him who had the one for the pillow of His divine infancy, and the other for the pillow of His dying

hours. You will find it all in your rosaries." Writing on the Holy Effigy of our Lord, the bishop says: "It has those large, clear, out-looking eyes that we expect in Him whose humanity was ever contemplating the Divinity, and is never concentrated on its own human nature, to be absorbed in it, or to feel its mortality as anything but a load and a sorrow that is to be torn to pieces as a sacrifice." And so, too, of other relics, he writes so contemplatively that his letters are as good as meditations. But to say a word on his "Easter Day in Rome." The year was 1870, when Pope Pius IX. was still Pope and king in his own city. "Yesterday, Easter Sunday, St. Peter's witnessed such a spectacle as was never witnessed before." And the explanation was easy to be given. Eight hundred mitres in St. Peter's on Easter Sunday was a spectacle unique and historic. Bishop Ullathorne was on the top of the Colonnade which runs around the front of the Vatican, so that he could see the whole wondrous sight from one point. He speaks of the Pope's voice (and no one who ever heard Pius the Ninth's voice, whether outside or inside the Vatican, can fail to justify the truth of the assertion) as being as musical as a well-toned instrument; so that "every one heard every word of the absolutions. And when he lifted his arms and voice for the Benediction, the voices of that sea of people, which had been as the sound of many waters, were hushed." And directly afterwards the cannon roared from St. Angelo, and the bells of all the churches rang out gladness, so that even the martial music of the bands of two regiments was somewhat lost in the uproar of glad sounds. Alas! the scene was not to be renewed, for many years of rudely secularized Rome. Pius IX. became a prisoner within the Vatican; and to this day the Pontiff cannot give his benediction, urbi et orbi, from St. Peter's.

Dr. Ullathorne, as all English Catholics know, was a Benedictine; so that it was natural that, when in Rome, especially, on St. Benedict's day, he should visit the grand and beautiful cathedral, and should look "through those ninety pillars, each of them one block of brightly polished granite some forty feet high," and should gaze on the august figure of our Divine Lord, seated on His throne; and should listen rapturously to the Benedictine simple chant. Afterwards came the gathering of the Benedictines. In the refectory, as he tells us, were black Benedictines and white Benedictines, blue Benedictines—the Olivetans, and Oriental Benedictines—the Mechitarists, with their Archimandrite in purple robe and white beard. There too was the Arch Abbot of Hungary, and the Abbot of the great Abbey of Einsiedeln; with the Abbot of Catanea; and also the General of the Jesuits, who always dined in this refectory on St. Benedict's day,

as the Benedictine General did in the Gesu on St. Ignatius's day. There too was the President General of the English Benedictines, and the General Superior of the American Benedictines: with a pleasant array of the monks and pupils of the schools.

And, as being appropriate to this subject of the Benedictine life, and of Dr. Ullathorne's personal devotion to his order, the following amusing episode may be mentioned. Being invited to preach in one of the London Catholic churches,—somewhere about the year 1840—Dr. Ullathorne ascended the pulpit in his religious habit, to the surprise and consternation of the congregation; and was subsequently taken to task by the senior priest of the church for such an outrage on British sentiment and susceptibility. That a priest should preach in the habit of a religious order called for a sharp rebuke, even from a priest. How little was it thought in those days—fifty years ago—that, within a quarter of a century, even the Anglican clergy would vie in their assumption of Catholic attire (some Anglican clergy even affecting a religious habit) and that the good British public would become as reconciled to priestly robes as for centuries they had been inimical to the word priest.

And while on this point of the religious habit, it may be relevant to note the ardor with which Bishop Ullathorne always regarded the religious life. Over and over again he speaks of his longing to leave the world, and to end his days in some Benedictine retreat. At one time we find him with the monks of Mount Mellerari; and dwelling on the revival of his aspirations to quit the world, and live and die in the beloved cloister. He lingers with affectionate sympathy on the Benedictine chant. He tells us how the two long choirs of white robed monks alternately sang the psalmody in three simple but sweet notes; with long pauses for reflection in the middle of each verse; and he adds that even the Gospel was sung in the same tones; while the Abbot gave the Benediction in the same tones; so that "the sweet accents with solemn pauses of silence, of that never varying monotony of rise and fall, under which the ever varying sense of the psalmody advanced, seemed to express the acquirement of an unchangeable peace and patience of soul; whilst the whole of the change of the movement was interior and contemplative. It seemed to realize that sentence of St. Augustine, 'Join thyself to eternity and thou shalt find rest.'" We cannot help noticing Dr. Ullathorne's love of the cloister in connection with his tremendous energy in so many countries. He seemed always to retain a vocation for the monastic life, along with—if that were possible—an equally marked vocation for the active life.

To return, however, to events of contemporary history. It was in the year 1870 that Bishop Grant died, of whom Bishop Ulla-

thorne said truly, "a saint has departed from this world." The first Bishop of Southwark, a part of London, this admirable and typical man left a memory behind him which was untarnished by a single weakness or imprudence. This is not the place in which to speak lengthily of his life. "The image of that vibrating soul," Bishop Ullathorne wrote, "is fixed on my mind;" and from the time when Dr. Grant was Rector of the English College in Rome to when he expired in Southwark, his whole life was a hymn of pure service. "Dying for two years," nothing changed the tone of his mind, nor the unwavering gentle humor of his character. "When the Hierarchy was being negotiated in Rome," writes Bishop Ullathorne, "Dr. Grant was the animating spirit." And truly does Dr. Ullathorne remark, "Look at the Diocese of Southwark as it was when he took it, and as it is now. . . . He brought up his will to his work, until he became all will." But we must not linger on this really beautiful life. The present writer, however, may be permitted to recall an episode, as illustrative of Dr. Grant's retentive memory, and also of his playful mood and spirit. In the year 1849, when travelling from Southampton to London, the present writer noticed a gentleman in the carriage who seemed to have a more or less priestly look. Engaging the apparent clergyman in conversation—and the fact having transpired that this clergyman lived somewhere in Southwark, the present writer asked him if he happened to know any local pastor who could baptize a child of six who lived in Southwark. "No, I do not know any such clergyman," said the reverend gentleman. "Perhaps," boldly inquired the present writer, "you do not belong to the Church of England?" "I cannot say I do," was the reply, "I am the Catholic Bishop of Southwark." Fourteen years passed; and in the year 1863, the present writer received an invitation to dine with the "Catholic bishop of Southwark," whom we had not seen nor heard of in the long interval. The very first remark the bishop made after his salutation,—and he made it with a humorous smile which was peculiar to him—was, "Did you ever get anybody to baptize that Anglican child?"

To take a leap to the year 1886, we find Dr. Ullathorne writing from Oscott to Father W. Amherst, and speaking of that marvellous spectacle, a Cardinal presiding over a Plenary Council in Australia. This fact brought to his mind his own struggles in that far-off country; when in 1833, he had "to do everything with three priests; one of whom I suspended, and with another I had immense difficulties." Dr. Ullathorne was indeed, as Cardinal Moran called him, "the living link between the old and the new;" the "Bishop of Birmingham" being no more strange to an Englishman, just after the restoration of the Hierarchy, than would

have been an Australian Cardinal to an Australian of 1833. From the time when young Willliam Ullathorne lived in his father's country house, aspiring to become a priest at some future day, to the time when Australia's first Cardinal followed upon Dr. Ullathorne's "three priests," was a world of progress to both Catholics and Anglicans; to the last perhaps even more than to the first; for the Catholic change was most conspicuous in civil liberties, while the Anglican change was from Evangelicalism to Ritualism.

II.

Dr. Ullathorne's friendships were many and earnest. Naturally we think first of his friendship for Dr. Newman, in regard to whose life, work and character, he has left much affectionate criticism. When writing on Dr. Newman's controversy with Mr. Kingsley, he described it as "the keenest scarification—and that of a muscular Christian—that ever man gave to man." Probably no one knew Dr. Newman better than did Dr. Ullathorne; for he could say of him, and could say to him in a letter even so far back as 1864, "we have now been personally acquainted, and much more than acquainted, for nineteen years; during more than sixteen of which we have stood in special relation of duty towards each other. This has been one of the singular blessings which God has given me amongst the cares of the episcopal office." Then, writing of Dr. Newman's vast literary labors, he adds that the establishment of the Congregation of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri; the commencing the founding of a university in Ireland; the many years of hard work at the mission in Alcester street, Birmingham, and the labors for the carrying on of the Convent of the Oratory; with other original and deeply responsible work; all such initiation and prolonged fatigue were additional to scholastic and literary toil, and made Dr. Newman's life very busy. And eighteen years after the letter quoted above, Dr. Ullathorne could address "My Lord Cardinal," and could speak of the "forty years of friendship and confidence that have enriched my life." To which letter of devotion the Cardinal could reply, "God reward you, my dear Lord, for your tenderness towards me, ... it is a token of sympathy which now, in my extreme age, encourages me in the prospect of the awful journey which lies close before me." These two men, alike perhaps in a certain heroism of patience, had passed careers as broadly different as possible in the outlines of their purpose and their struggle. We can scarcely figure Dr. Newman as fighting the secular authorities in distant colonies; and we can scarcely figure Dr. Ullathorne as heading a school of Anglican thought in a University where there was not even a single Catholic. Both men were typical, were superlative; and in their old age must have

enjoyed each other's friendship all the more from the very variety of their experiences.

Dr. Ullathorne had many friends in Ireland, where he passed, he tells us, nearly three years; and it is interesting to hear him giving his impressions as to the solution of the political difficulties of his day. "Does it really at this day require to be stated that for nearly forty years I have been the devoted servant of the Irish people?" He enters minutely into all he has seen and known in regard to the tortured interests of Irishmen. From 1832 to 1840 he lived among the Irishmen who had been transported for the affairs of '98; he knew the inmost hearts of these men, who represented about three-quarters of a century of the history of the Irish people. "I spent the best years of my life in laboring to mitigate the evils, redress the wrongs, and soften the sorrows of 30,000 Irishmen, most of which had been brought about through the misgovernment of their country." And it may be said that to Dr. Ullathorne, mainly, was due the bringing to an end of the horrible system of transportation which long prevailed. The rigors of that system in the colonies were reduced at least one-half, and were finally very nearly put an end to, by the persevering protests and entreaties of the good missionary who "never took a refusal." The whole gist, in his opinion, of Ireland's wrongs was the confiscating of the land that belonged to Irishmen, and passing it over to Englishmen and Scotchmen, who "ignored the Irishman's perpetual right to his land." And, he adds, "until our legislators understand this they will never know what they have to deal with."

It was in the year 1884 that he visited France; and we will give an extract from his impressions of the Holy Curé of Ars, not only for its vivid portraiture of the man, but because it reveals his own faculty of perception. He heard the Curé preach, and he says, "As he went on, the vivacity and vigor of his spirit, mantling through his feeble suffering frame, increased in energy. His voice, soft yet shrill, rose into cries of anguish as he spoke of sin; his hand, doubled up, pressed itself between his eyes on his forehead; his eyebrows shrank together and he wept as he always weeps when he speaks of sin. Then he opened his eyes again; and those deeply shaded recesses became full of light; and he threw his feeble hands appealingly towards the people, who listened in profound attention and even awe. Then his eyes were cast up and his whole figure seemed to follow. He spoke of God, so good, so amiable, so loving; and his whole being seemed to circle round his heart, on which his hands, his shoulders, his whole person seemed to concentrate. It was impossible not to feel that God was wholly there, and drew his whole being to that centre. Then there was one word about being in the heart of Jesus; and

in that word I felt he himself was there in a way I shall not easily forget." But when we once begin to quote Dr. Ullathorne's descriptions on almost every subject which he pictured, it is difficult to know where to leave off.

It was the same with his visit to La Salette: "You can have no idea of the giant grandeur of this mountainous country, and of the contrast of the beautiful slopes and soft verdure which sweep down on all sides towards the fountain of La Salette. Our Lady has certainly a very perfect judgment in selecting her sanctuaries. . . . . I returned quite full of La Salette, about which I must publish something in honor of Our Lady, *Our Mother;* for since I stood on that lovely mountan 'Our Lady' has grown to be a phrase too cold for me."

A word may be added in regard to the Beatification of the English martyrs. Dr. Ullathorne was a descendant of Sir Thomas More, the illustrious Chancellor, Saint and Martyr—ever to be honored. "My grandfather," he wrote, "used to talk of his mother having the watch and the garter of Sir Thomas More, as Knight of the Garter; what became of them I do not know; but at Stone the nuns have a considerable piece of his hair shirt and a rough one it is." In speaking of the Martyrs from the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's persecutions, to the end of William and Mary's coarse spitefulness, Dr. Ullathorne says that the English persecutions were far worse than those of the Roman Emperors. And he remarks, "what a figure the Protestant bishops and ministers cut in it!" Their worldliness seems to have almost puzzled Dr. Ullathorne. But he is so full of admiration for the English Martyrs, and naturally for his glorious ancestor, Sir Thomas More, that he cannot help a passing regret that the high spirit of the clergy of those times should have been followed by "the poverty-stricken spirit of our time." Yet doubtless, were the persecution renewed, the modern spirit would rise to the occasion.

III.

And now to speak particularly of Dr. Ullathorne's spiritual writings—perhaps even superior in their grace to his other writings—and to briefly hint at their compass and their objects.

It is not perhaps too much to say that these letters are all perfect of their kind. Profound, yet most simple in expression; full of wise counsel, yet delightfully playful and natural; it is all the same whether he writes to novices or to Reverend Mothers; in every case he always says the exact thing. We had selected a large number of extracts; but to give them would make this paper too long. His letters on Spiritual Darkness, Interior Purgation, Adhering to the Will of God, Special Interior Trials,

Recollection, Confidence, Silence, Poverty of Spirit, Self-sacrifice, Indiscreet Austerities, indeed on most of the trials or virtues of the Religious State, are, all of them, exceptionally worth reading. Naturally, when some Benedictine nuns were setting sail for Australia he was reminded of his own departure for that far off land, when as a young and solitary priest—one of four in the whole colony—he had to brave any hardship that might be before him. He advises the emigrant nuns to be "devout for those souls who have perished beneath the waters"; a beautiful yet rare devotion, and one of which few voyagers care to think. He calls the mission of the Sisters "a spiritual martyrdom"—going from home, and to a world where there are no friends. "When you tread that ground (Australia) I have so often trodden, pray for me." We know that the good Archbishop always remembered Australia as a rough school in which he had learned to brunt the world, and as having fortified him for his after comparatively mild troubles. It was in Australia too that he had thoroughly studied the Irish nature; and he would often refer in Birmingham, to his "Irish education," which, as he used to say had taught him a good deal of human nature—a good thing for a priest to learn in the best schools.

In one of his letters he gives a curious, pleasing tradition accepted as at least probable by the Jews. After mentioning that it is believed that Abraham offered up Isaac on the exact spot where Adam had been buried, he says that Adam nearing his death, sent Seth to implore the angel who guarded Paradise, to let him have one of the fruits from the Tree of Life. Seth, bringing it, was then asked that, when Adam died, this fruit should be placed in his mouth, a communion from the Tree of Life. So it was done, and from it sprang a tree, and that tree came at length to the ground, and of its wood was made the Cross on which our Lord hung in sacrifice—over the grave of Adam, the first man.

We are tempted to give two or three short maxims, which the archbishop would let drop in his letters, such as: Second thoughts are not always best, but third thoughts that bring us back to first thoughts. Quite as many troubles come from too much zeal as from too little action. There is no sore so sad as discontent with self. Where there is no sin there may be trouble, but there is no real distress. No harm ever comes of doing what is right. There is a justice which God owes to His own eternal plans. . . . . It belongs to the magnificence of His justice to Himself and to His everlasting plan that He shou d complete His work . . . . To this magnificence of that justice to Himself may our will ever open. And finally, it is a good thought of the Archbishop that time is only a sense of our earthliness; for if we could be wholly absorbed in God in this life, we should have no sense of time.

It would be unnecessary to speak here of the Archbishop's larger works: his "Groundwork of Christian Virtues," over which he spent great labor, and of which he wrote to a friend: "Every sentence has to be weighed theologically; I am just now at the ticklish part of the book; namely, the degrees of humility"; his "Endowments of Man," so highly praised by Cardinal Newman; or his "Ecclesiastical Discourses," full of pregnant and often original composition. The Archbishop had a style of his own, which united the critical keenness of the student with the broad sympathies of one who knew the world. He was never dull, heavy, dry; he wrote as a man of warm feeling, and seemed to think, with Cardinal Newman, that it was a mistake to speak of man as primarily a rational being; he is primarily a being of sentiment and affection.

IV.

It is twelve years since the Archbishop celebrated his Golden Jubilee. He sang his Jubilee Mass and his Te Deum in the College Chapel of Oscott; and the whole college, even to its youngest member, received Holy Communion at his hands. He became dangerously ill in the autumn of 1884, but rallied so as to renew his public work in his diocese. In the next year he wrote several wonderful letters, and we may spare a moment to quote one or two of his criticisms, those on George Eliot and Thomas Carlyle. As to George Eliot, he wrote: "Her whole life was a conflict between her Christian reminiscences and the fragments of her conscience and Positivism; and this, with German Hegelism, underlies her whole soul in her writings, although the sectarian pietism of her (Calvinist) family furnished many of her chief characters. I have read three of her books, and should say that they were unhealthy in tone, owing to the mind from which they spring." The Archbishop, however, is careful to add elsewhere that "Adam Bede" is both "keenly religious" and "full of heart."

As to Carlyle, the two pages of criticism are as good as anything that has been written of that sage: "His philosophy was as egotistical as himself; its basis, derived from Kant and his school, purely egotistical. Notwithstanding his constant insistence on truth and honesty above all things, he could write to religious people in their own language without the least sense of religion in himself. He is always in the 'infinities' and 'eternities' without ever once asking the question, what is infinite, what is eternal? He has no object before him in it all." The whole criticism is as true as it is severe. Probably no Englishman of this century has more abounded in mental activity while having less object, less reality, than Carlyle.

The year 1889 was the last of the Archbishop's life. In the previous year he had been created Archbishop of Cabasa—the old Metropolitan See of Lower Egypt—and was in fair health and not very feeble; indeed, Cardinal Newman, who survived him, was the feebler of the two, and would lean on the arm of the Archbishop; but in the spring of the year 1889 he had a return of his complication of maladies, which terminated fatally in a few weeks. So long as his strength lasted he read eagerly, and in one of his last letters he wrote: "I have been engaged with the second volume of Fr. Gasquet's book on 'Henry VIII. and The Monasteries.' What a revelation that book is; and what an illustration of the scoundrels of the Reformation." His illness, however, was of short duration, and as one of his faithful attendants recorded, "No one who saw him at that time could fail to notice how fearlessly, and in what a simple matter of-fact way he set about what he called 'the business of dying.' "How simple it all is when the end comes," he remarked to his physician. And to another friend he said: "I have been thinking that if there is anything in my life that may induce God to have mercy on me, it is that I have never forgotten to take care of His nuns." At the very last he was asked by a friend who had heard him utter some words about the angels, "Do you see St. Benedict and the angels?" "Yes, I see them," was the reply. And he continued to ejaculate tenderly until he died.

On the Feast of St. Benedict he expired. The funeral obsequies were conducted at St. Chad's, Birmingham; and he was buried in St. Joseph's Chapel, in the Convent Church of St. Dominic, Stone; in that convent church where but a short time before the Reverend Mother Margaret had been buried, of whose memory he had written lengthily and beautifully.

V.

After reading through the Archbishop's writings, and especially the Autobiography and the Letters, we feel that we have been studying one whose breadth of character was a fine natural soil for his grand piety. Nor was the Archbishop ever anything but real—true to his instinctive manliness and nobility. It was a splendid education for the after-missionary to be cast among the varied sects of a Protestant neighborhood, he being himself strongly and stoutly built up in Catholic faith, sentiment and devotion. To a weaker mind such an education might have been risky, but to a sturdy, unflinching Catholic, with admirable parents to guide him, his early combats with a score of creeds were simply bracing. And so, too, his Colonial struggles and vicissitudes nerved him for his after-life in an English town. Birmingham is one of the rough

marts of British enterprise, where commerce is more thought of than the fine arts, and where Catholicity, fifty years ago, was of foreign growth. It was not a congenial nor a sympathetic atmosphere, yet Bishop Ullathorne so won all hearts by his straightforwardness that it was a common thing for those most hostile to his religion to come to consult him about worldly affairs—and about religion. He made numerous converts. His word was never questioned, for he was a true man. He therefore, naturally, became attached to his diocese, not only in a religious but in a social sense. A Benedictine, a man of books, a habitual student, he was nevertheless perfectly at home with the commercial classes; and in later years, when the name of "Newman of Edgbaston" was almost a household word with all classes in Birmingham, "the two great Catholics, Ullathorne and Newman," were as popular with the townspeople as in their own spheres. Now, when we remember that a very short period has passed since Birmingham—like the rest of the English nation—went crazy over the "Papal Aggression," and sent forth its protests against such enormity, we can appreciate the admirable tact and the convincing virtues of the first Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham. To hear the Archbishop chat in old age, when in company with a few sympathetic intimates, about his personal recollections of "sixty years ago" (that was about the year 1830) was to be reborn into a period when the whole national English mind was deeply steeped in intense horror of Popery. Even the children, in those days, looked on a Jesuit and a policeman, or on any Catholic priest and a gruesome enemy, as having dread characteristics in common; so that it was not uncommon in the public streets for the young people to "give a wide berth" to the Popish priest who was known to be guilty of saying Mass. (Our friends, the Ritualists, who now talk of "continuity," must certainly look upon *that* link with mingled feelings.) Bishop Ullathorne had seen it all, had known it all; so that his feeling of intense gratitude for "better days" was enlivened by playful memories of the ugly past.

Yet it may be replied that the good Archbishop had such remembrances in common with many a score of Catholic priests. This is true; yet it was not given to every priest to have that robust force of endurance which was characteristic of the young and the old Benedictine. He was a sharp disciplinarian with himself, and therefore with every person under his control. No one ever got the better of him in a pitched battle—of the intellectual or the moral groove or kind. He was none the less beloved for that magistracy, by priests, or by laity, or by Protestants. A Bishop should be royal in his authority, for his subjects will not be loyal if he is not. The present writer has heard priests, laity and

Protestants, who knew the Archbishop and understood him, professing their warm homage for a Chief Pastor, who ruled others only because he ruled himself. If it might be permitted to institute a comparison: Dr. Ullathorne and Dr. Grant were alike in their self-ruling, yet different in their natural tone and in their manner. Dr. Grant was wonderfully simple and unspoiled; the world did not seem to have ever tarnished him; he might have been born without original sin, so far as the innocence of his presence betokened a natural guilelessness and purity. Was it St. Cyprian who said, "timor innocentiæ custos?" Yet the absence of the *timor*, when it seems absent from pure ignorance, is certainly the more winning and captivating. Dr. Ullathorne was a type of conquering duty; Dr. Grant, of almost absence of need of conquest.

And these types were bred of the Catholic faith alone; without the aid of cheerful surroundings in a social sense, indeed in spite of all surroundings, all enmities. English Catholics will forever owe a debt of gratitude to the ecclesiastics of the very doleful Protestant period. Such men as Dr. Ullathorne had a sort of life-long social martyrdom; and it was much the same up to about the year 1860. The Oxford movement first relaxed the chains of martyrdom. From that date there sprang up a rivalry—not a hatred. Dr. Newman, intellectually, relaxed the chains; Dr. Manning, socially and officially, relaxed them; and Dr. Ullathorne with Dr. Grant, and many other bishops and priests, passed their lives in weaving pleasant bands of sympathy. Our easy heritage is mostly the fruit of their toil. The Archbishop of Cabasa closed a three centuried period, which had been like the wanderings of the Israelites in the desert.

A. F. Marshall.

NOTES TO SHOW THE NECESSITY OF TRUE RELIGION FOR RATIONAL MEN.

[The following *Notes* were left in manuscript by the gifted writer, whose premature decease is widely deplored. They were suggested to his mind by the desire to convert a non-Catholic friend. We very willingly publish these original thoughts, as well for their intrinsic merit as for an example of what is done by some, and might be done by many more of our young Catholic laymen, while pursuing their ordinary avocations, and without any special training in theology or metaphysics. The glow and enthusiasm that mark their closing sentences are indicative of the habit of thought of one whose delicate health made him a constant and exact thinker on religious subjects.—EDITOR.]

ALL men desire happiness.

Happiness is the satisfaction of all desires. But natural desires are opposed by natural powers, thus: All men naturally desire to know, but no man can explicitly apprehend all knowledge, and no share of explicit knowledge yields satisfaction of the desire to know; therefore,

Happiness in the natural order is impossible.

It is true, exceptions may be taken to this line of argument. A man's pleasure in the natural order may be relatively so great, his desires may be so far satisfied, that the abstract happiness which is an impossibility ceases to be of practical value. But what has the world to do with those few of its people who batten on the wreckage of the majority's lost ventures; who, sheltered in sunny estuaries, live in a perpetual summer of human affection and well ordered sensuousness? But, again, there are multitudes who would jest at the inexorable demonstration of the impossibility of human happiness; for are not these multitudes happy in their lives of toil and triumphant ignorance, that crass and invincible enmity to intellectual light which yields a sombre enjoyment of its own? But does the world concern itself more about this last than about the first class of exceptions to the universal fact? This universal principle, or fact, points very plainly to the superior fact that man is destined for a supernatural end, of which happiness is necessarily understood; unless it may be said that our desire for happiness and, by implication, all our other natural desires, are valueless as motives for sustained action—for a desire destined never to be gratified were an intolerable absurdity for a rational mind.

Herein we are not making universality of extent or number, but universality of the integral qualities of human nature a test of truth.

Most assuredly, if humanity is merely a so-called higher development of animal life there should not arise in the affections of men or abide in their thoughts any conception of a higher destiny, except in degree, than may be anticipated by an elephant or a dog, and unless elephants and dogs somehow think of a future state of gratification superior to those they now enjoy, our thoughts of heaven are peculiar to mankind. At any rate, they are peculiar, inasmuch as they can only be relative in their completeness to ourselves, in virtue of our peculiar superiority over animals. But there is better testimony for the fact of our eternal destiny, in a deeper search of our nature and the conditions of our life.

No one will deny we are creatures of social instincts, and no one will deny that, without law extraneous to instinct, society would be a brutal herding, fatal to all but the strongest, and fatal to such blissful conditions as the family and the State. Expediency would no more avail than it does in Central Africa where it is unknown; such rude society as there exists being maintained as much by the laws of so-called superstitious origin as by any supposable knowledge of the expediency of hygiene or mercy, and expediency, at any rate, means nothing if its development were not sumptuary laws, for pickaninnies are not born with a fully thought-out scheme of action founded on motives of expediency. A child is born with aggressive instincts, the embryonic passions of the man, and child and man alike are forced to bend the will to do or not to do in obedience to law. In so far as law is the result of mere expediency, it is variable; for what is expedient under certain conditions is not under others. But there are invariable laws, irrelative and superior to expediency, unless life should not always be respected, even when murder can be done with impunity; unless some recondite argument from expediency justifies Orestes, and Othello, or Francesca and Paolo. We can now see clearly that men are actuated by contrary motives; innate passions, disordered and affronting, are kept in check, not by any inborn counter-power, nor by reason's consideration of temporal exigencies, but by consience, a higher reasoning, whereby we recognize laws superior to natural conditions, laws which you cannot attack without advocating anarchy. You must attack the heaven whence come the highest laws of life, if you wish to complete the circle of negation back to the starting point, where again you will be confronted with the undeniable affirmation that man is destined for a supernatural end.

"Man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."—S. Matthew, iv., 4.

"The question is not about your gold and silver, not your lands

or farms, not even your bodily health is in peril, but we address your souls about obtaining eternal life and fleeing eternal death. Rouse yourselves therefore. . . . . You see it all, and know it, and groan over it; yet God sees that there is nothing to detain you in so pestiferous and sacrilegious a separation, if you will but overcome your carnal affection, for the obtaining the spiritural kingdom, and shake off the fear of wounding friendships, which will avail nothing in God's judgment, in order to escape eternal punishment. Go think over the matter, consider what can be said in answer. . . . . No one blots out from heaven the ordinance of God, no one blots out from earth the Church of God; He hath promised; she hath filled the whole world."—St. Augustine, quoted by Cardinal Newman in the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine."

The skeptic's position is necessarily a position of defence, because it does not appeal to him as wholly true, nor as being of the nature of essential truth as far as it may be true at all. The fact of his dissatisfaction with it is one of the first notes of the falsity of his philosophy, as may be shown by the rationalist's own criterion of the facts of human nature and life. Time and again have the childhood developments of human nature been studied and appealed to, and no truth is more striking than that the immature mind is singularly accurate in its perception of truth, discriminating by an apparently instinctive process,—using instinctive to indicate a rational action which defies analysis,—and co-ordinate with this is an equally singular trustfulness which enables children to accept and in a true measure understand, without difficulty, incomprehensible truths offered in good faith. Childhood, in virtue of baptismal and even natural innocence, enjoys better in immaturity that divine gift of perfectly assimilating humanity's proper nutriment of truth, than right-minded men whose powers are impeded, overlaid, and contradicted by their attachment to evil. This appeal is made to an universal phenomenon, superior to the exceptions of stupid, weak, or vicious children, who are sufficiently rare. Some learned philosopher has said, "man consists in truth," and so far is this a fact, that nothing but truth pervading all his intellectual life will make him conscious that he is, in the sense of knowing his existence in a satisfactory manner; wherefore it may be said of a man in search of truth that he seeks himself.

I ought not, my dear friend, to have to say to you that God is truth itself; that "man consists in truth" in the sense that he partakes of the qualities of divinity; and that, therefore, in proving that God exists, I prove to you the only reason that you yourself exist.

We know as God the Father of the universe. Coexistent and coeternal with the Father is His only-begotten Son, and from them proceeds, and of the nature of their eternity has always been, the Holy Ghost, and these three distinct Persons are one God. Except as we know this Holy Trinity we do not fully know God, and as often as we use the word God we mean the one true God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Thus you shall recognize the identity of God. Of His attributes, we will enlarge only on that which appeals to our intelligence as the most striking proof of His existence. God is the Father of the universe, except that the word father inadequately signifies that comprehensive and sufficient attribute whereby creation is simply an act of willing. He said: "Let there be light; and there was light." "He that sendeth forth light and it goeth; and hath called it, and it obeyed Him with trembling. And the stars have given light in their watches and rejoiced. They were called and they said: Here we are; and with cheerfulness they have shined forth to Him that made them."

Since it appeals to our intelligence, gratifying us in a manner different from any sensitive pleasure, like sunlight or the taste of pleasant fruits, the world around gives ample evidence that it was created by an intelligent being. The theory of spontaneous evolution advanced by the positivist scientists destroys itself, because their method precludes an appeal to any criterion except observation and experience, and observation and experience teach nothing as being more primitively causal than matter and mechanical force, of neither of which things can it be shown that they are or can be self-existent. Now, to a self-existent essence only can be ascribed the origin of all things. Matter and motion are not self-existent, because one without the other would be meaningless; as a force is no force if there be nothing for it to act upon, and matter is nothing if it be not acted on by force; nor could force come out of matter, or *vice versa*, because energy-force and non-energy-matter are contradictory terms.

Thus it is shown that matter and motion are not self-existent, and if they are not self-existent they are not eternal, for self-existence and eternity are interdependent terms. We need not care that "countless eons of time" have transpired since matter and motion came from God. If always He chose to create, they are practically eternal as to posterior duration, but not eternal in any potential sense. It is attempted by some men to ascribe the origin of things to the laws governing matter and motion, as gravitation. Such a law as gravitation could only be imagined to prevail as being peculiarly fitted to matter and motion as the things to be governed by it; and, therefore, oversetting the fallacy that matter

and motion are self-existent, also oversets the fallacious appeal to natural law as the eternal origin of things. Moreover, in the application of law in the concrete we find an assemblage of laws, and, confining our thought to natural law, each separate law appears, evidently, the result of another, and no one is so universal as to be the cause of all the rest and the cause of itself also; but, all acting co ordinately and interdependently, it follows that natural law is the effect of a higher cause than it is itself. This holds of all secondary causes in our explicit knowledge that they are also effects, and this proves the existence of the First Cause outside of and superior to all other causes. Moreover, the First Cause must be different from all other causes, inasmuch as it exists of itself, while they as being effects as well as causes must exist dependently on the First Cause; exist dependently in the sense that the omnipotent, omniscient, eternal, and infinite Being sustains, as of necessity, by a function of His supreme life, every atom of secondary existence. Without the First Cause there were nothing; not organic nor inorganic matter; not motion nor the void—but what words can represent the annihilation which is not and cannot be thought, even as an hypothesis?

The First Cause is supreme, and therefore cannot be limited in its nature by the subordinate causes which are the effects of it. We know the First Cause to be God, because of it alone can be affirmed supreme attributes, as self-existence, which implies personality, and personality implying intelligence and will, wisdom and love, and all things worthy of God.

Personality is that perfection of an individual being of an intelligent nature whereby it is constituted and distinguished from all others, and we cannot think of God except as a personal Being, because, as the First Cause supreme, He exists alone, separate, and unequalled.

There is a three-fold action in the operation of our human intellect; the single personality has a multiple life, and, as the learned Father Walworth has explained, understanding of this leads by a true induction to our understanding of the Holy Trinity of God, as far as it is needful for us to understand the mystery. The operations of intelligence are of three kinds. We think a thought, and view it as extraneous to the womb of intelligence whence it came, and, conversely, thought turns about and questions the source of its being, and, at once, between the fecund intelligence and its child of thought there is glowing a common affection,—a distinct and integral action of the intellect. Our thoughts become, as it were, corporate parts of our intellectual life. They are the happy brood of memory, and the love of the mind for its offspring, as well as for the children of its adoption, makes up

our habit of thought, itself as capable of objective consideration and analysis as its subject-matter, or as the thinking essence, the passive intellect.

Personality is not contradicted by this analysis of its life, because we cannot think of personality except as a living principle, and life means an internal action of of the essence of the living thing; but action implies powers and objects, whence we at once understand the three-fold action of the soul to be as absolutely elementary an idea, as divinely perfect in its composition as is the triangle, the symbol of it, and the unit of statical perfection in mechanics. While the three-fold action of the soul is not a perfect trinity of persons, since, because of our finiteness, the begotten thought is begotten in time successively as partial thoughts, and, therefore, is not coequal with the passive substance whence it comes, and the same inferiority holds of our will, yet we must understand a coequal personality of the Trinity of God as of the essence of life in Him.

There is the living Father; and the only begotten Word, the Son; and, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is the Divine Will, the eternal love, the Holy Ghost; and all three, Father, Son and Holy Ghost of the eternity of God's personality must be coequal in all the dignities of that personality and are infinite, eternal and self-subsisting; distinct Persons, in the same order of being one of the other, and yet inseparably One in the unity of the Supreme Nature, of which our own is but a faint image, but of which the same principle of life must necessarily hold.

Of the incomprehensibly intimate union of the Persons of the Holy Trinity we can only understand that the life of the Father is interchangeably in the Son and in the Holy Ghost, and the life of them in Him and in one another, a reciprocal action of being not necessarily repugnant to the idea of distinct personalities. And all this is clear in the light of the Eternity of God. Since God is Eternal, from all eternity has the Son been begotten and the Holy Ghost proceeded, and to their being distinct Persons it cannot be objected, that, because of their absolute personality, in them should be developed a further subdivision of life powers, such as they are of the Trinity of God; for there would then have to be three separate eternities and infinities, which is absurd. Yet again, for the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost not to be Persons, reciprocally sharing in and themselves being of the triune essence of Deity, of one or of the other must inferiority be supposed, which is also absurd because, except as each and all are equally from eternity they are not of God, and if they are not all equally of God, God is not. Now, the Trinity is the secret of God's self-existence. He needs not us, but how do we need not Him?

We must understand of humanity's necessary inferiority as a creation, that there are certain accidents marking that inferiority, which cannot attach to God. He is neither finite nor material, because finiteness and materiality are among the peculiar marks of creatures as contradistinguished from the Creator. The lesser facts of life in which these marks of our inferiority are manifested are simply developed by action of the quality of growth, one of the highest gifts in the order of creation and which reaches directly back to the Creator; for by growth we behold the expanding of innumerable beauties previously passive in the condition of the creature's power of fecundation out of which are born buds and blossoms and seeds which shall in turn produce new life—or perish, at the will alone of the Supreme Life-giver, God. The beauty of all spiritual creations and material things, from the luminous splendor of a seraph to the tender loveliness of the most modest wayside flower, comes from God; but, in the different orders of creation, this beauty becomes a fainter and fainter reflection of His glory, as it passes from angels to men and from men to the lower orders of material things, matter being the peculiar limitation of the lower order of created entities.

The skeptic's appeal to conditions of natural law as answerable for the failure of fecundation is sound enough in the sense, that through these conditions is the will of God expressed. Unless natural law is self-sustaining, it has no moral value, and as expression of God's will—a will of which we can only think as being arbitrarily superior to all things except principles of moral right, as truth or justice—natural law is variable with an eccentricity more unsearchable than the orbit of a comet, or the immeasurable intensity of storms.

To the ordinary physiologist the idea of the resurrection of the body is most repugnant, on account of his common-sense understanding of natural law, an understanding based on experimental data whose first development is the theory of invariable and unalterable principles of action or construction in the operations of organic life and chemical phenomena. This theory is sound enough in the abstract, supposing an explicit understanding of the order of precedence of specific laws among themselves and their subordination severally and collectively to laws of more universal application. Herein lies the secret of skepticism among physicians. They implicitly, sometimes explicitly, maintain, that, because they have so deep and accurate a knowledge of specific laws, therefore, all laws are explicitly knowable by men, and that, since they cannot weigh and note experimentally the superior law of physics which vindicates the apparent paradox of the resurrection over against the sensible phenomena of death and decomposition, therefore, such a law is an absurd hypothesis.

At the resurrection our bodies will rise in the dignity of superior conditions which are sufficiently comprehensible when we examine, as deeply as we may, into the elements of matter. For instance, the resurrected body will be so glorified that, at will, the immortal man can place himself here or there, even as our Lord appeared among the twelve when the doors of the room were closed. Knowing as we do, that the most elementary conditions of matter which we can reach are gaseous, and not troubling ourselves to search more deeply, we can understand clearly enough a superior condition of our bodies, a gaseous condition mayhap, in virtue of which no more ponderable substance than like gases could interrupt the passage of the immortal being. It matters not how far distant from a divine explanation may be this crude suggestion of supernatural possibilities, since it is accurate and refined enough to answer the student of physics, who, certainly, can offer no proof against the nature and destiny of man as we know these things through the testimony of reason and holy revelation. Reason is sufficient to satisfy us of the possibility of the resurrection, even in the light of our present small attainment in physical knowledge, and only the most obtuse materialist may refuse the argument from personality. Surely, if our personality is not a fiction, unless body and soul united are not absolutely corrupt and every function of physical life is, therefore, bad in itself, surely our personality holds of the body as well as of the soul; and, again, therefore, unless the soul is not immortal, the body of which it so holds in the essence of personality, is raised also to an immortal state, and unavoidably this common personality defends its subject-matter through every vicissitude of time, or place, or chemical transmutation.

Until the wisdom of God is made plain to us in His judgment, these mysteries must be taken at His word, and, if he cannot disprove the historical tradition of that Word, the proudest scientist must cheerfully bow to the testimony of the very Truth itself.

It cannot be argued, that, since virtually and genetically all our qualities of being are contained in God as the First Cause, therefore, the evil in us must come from God, because, just as there are dispositions of us which are peculiar to us because of our defectiveness as creatures, so there are others which are a consequence of our first parents having chosen, of their free will, a state of moral being necessarily partaking of evil.

It is necessary to explain here the difference between moral evil and material evil, or what we may call active and passive evil. It is evident that evil as a passive quality must always be as a contrary to good, since we cannot imagine an abstract quality without its contrary; neither good without evil, softness without hardness,

sweetness without bitterness, nor light without darkness—in short, no affirmative without a negative.

Now, this is the essential difference between good and evil; evil of its nature is negative, incapable of life, of growth, of changing phases, except what it borrows of intensity from the fatal marriage between the "body of its death" and the perverse human will; whereas, on the contrary, "good" and "life" are synonymous. Good is of the nature of God; a quality presupposing activity, life, growth, positive energy; a quality capable of prevailing infinitely in virtue of its being of the Nature of God—contrarily to evil which, except as a negative possibility, prevails only in the action of those poor souls who have embraced it. Evil does not hold of our nature as it comes from God, and to explain the marks of evil in us we must explain the origin of moral evil itself. That evil cannot come from God is plain since He is Goodness Itself, and as good is the contrary of evil, the existence of one implies absence of the other, as a thing cannot be and not be at the same time.

Our existence is sufficient answer to the question, "Why did God create us," because our existence is good, a positive good; our happiness is positively good; and the immediate sources of our happiness—our well-ordered love of our fellows and of self, our love of heaven and earth, and in themselves every form of life therein, all is good, and this fact of good positively knowable sufficiently vindicates the wisdom of creation as for the glory of the Creator, unless you say it is a better good that good shall not exist.

The will of God is supreme; of itself the implicit law of the universe, since it is the source of all law. Law holds peculiarly of will, and we, therefore, understand that moral evil had its origin in the rebellion of created wills against the supreme will of the Creator.

It may not be supposed that created wills might not have refrained from rebelling against God, nor can we imagine that it were better if God had not created will capable of rebelling, because we cannot think a greater good than the good of free will, or, rather, there is no greater good known in this life than the good of free will.

We are wont to speak of the imperfection of the world around and of human nature, meaning by imperfection, not the existence of evil, but the relatively meagre endowment of created things with qualities of goodness; that is, it is a defect in a man to be born blind, or that the highest intelligence brings forth its brood of noble thoughts only with labor and slowly. But God alone is infinite and, therefore, perfect beyond compare, and He can always

add new qualities of goodness to His works from the exhaustless store of His own goodness and, as a thing which can be made more good is not perfect, it follows that His creations must always be imperfect in whatever degree they may please Him.

It is the last ditch of the retreating questioner of the established order of things to say there is no evil; that what appears to be evil is not so; nor sorrow, nor disease, nor death, nor sin are aught but phases of a good we cannot fathom. This is specious, but the test of the inductive method will show its fallacy. We have shown how evil is the necessary contrary of good, and disease and death are phases of passive evil energized by its fatal union with a corrupt human will.

We have said that the essence of moral evil is disobedience of law; that is, evil holds of the will, except as it is the passive negation of good. Now, unless humanity is so constituted that it neither loves nor hates, or, in other words, unless it is not of the essence of will to be affected for or against contrary things, there can be no moral evil. But what are the facts? Question your own heart and, seeking not to shelter yourself in subterfuges, reflect upon its true testimony to your loves and hates. You, who respect facts only, should give a just, aye, a generous hearing to the witness of your own will—a fact of dignity. If you will not do one thing nor another, if even to survive or perish is truly indifferent to you; if to live in the sunlight of nobility and purity rather than in the night of intellectual and sensual infamy is a choice you are careless of making; if to see honor and virtue contemned and falsehood and lust triumphant arouses not your indignation; if to see the human race recede to the gloomy state of savagery were a spectacle of no abhorrence in your eyes, then, perhaps, not only is there no evil, but also there is no good, or, what is more likely, you are a limb of Satan. This is certainly inductive; this is certainly appealing to self-evident and incontrovertible fact, and, unless you wish to be party to the nihilist's farce of denying the nature of things, you cannot long indulge the absurd optimism of supposing there is no evil. Certainly, it might have pleased God to have refrained from creating beings of free will and thus prevented moral evil and the necessity for its everlasting punishment, but what does such an hypothesis avail us? Certainly, it has not pleased Him to act in this way, and it may be said here, once for all, that the human mind is guilty of no more heinous absurdity than this hypothetical questioning of the wisdom of God's providence in the spirit of a man making these idle hypotheses a test for his acceptance or rejection of the body of Faith.

Examine the facts of Providence; prove them; be as inductive as you will, but when your thought at last confronts itself with the awful presence of the Omnipotent God, then bow and tremble. Tremble at the appalling danger of lifting—as did Lucifer—a proud front against the Eternal; of presuming to measure and weigh the inscrutable wisdom of Him out of whose infinite goodness the goodness of your life has come. That He has made you, gifted you with the exalted faculty of knowing him and hoping for heaven, plainly imposes a responsibility upon you of obeying Him—of loving Him. Spake the Redeemer: "Before Abraham was, I am." We partake of the immortality of God in being created for everlasting life, and out of this co-ordinate eternity of being can come nothing but eternal results.

The facts of life cannot be evaded, and a man's life of thought is as real as his life of action. Vague and incoherent are the broodings of the illiterate toiler; crystalline and acutely logical are the high speculations of the scholar; but both one and the other have common thoughts and labor with common mysteries. The numberless grains of his harvest teach the same lesson to the peasant as the telescope's myriad revelations teach to the scientist. Infinity! Eternity! Blot out human intelligence and then you can say the thoughts these words signify are not realities. God creates an immortal soul, and it cannot be imagined that God creates these souls as a planet throws off meteoric dust, because nothing is except God is; nothing exists except God sustains it, and therefore, to destroy the soul as a meteor is destroyed, you must destroy God. Once the soul is created by God, in the infinite function of His life is its life sustained, and, moreover, in the fact of personality is found the individual soul's inviolability of life; for unless life, generically speaking, can cease as an eternal fact, the life of the individual soul cannot cease as an eternal fact.

Religious beliefs are developments of natural facts, or, secondarily, are developments in turn of specific from generic beliefs, and revelation is the testimony of divine authority to truths whose natural basis is too deep for common knowledge. But also, of course, revelation is divine testimony to facts in the supernatural order which have what we may call a natural relation to the evident facts of human life.

Thus, divine revelation confirms the doctrine of hell which, philosophically considered, is the unavoidable development of our knowledge of the soul's immortality and of our acknowledged responsibility before the law.

A so-called future probation is the only escape from the inexorable logic of facts, but the hypothesis of a future probation can-

not stand before its own corollary, that, if there is a future probation, this life is no probation at all. God is perfect, and his works are perfect in themselves, and man's intelligence is proportioned to his responsibilities, or else God is a haphazard experimenter and man is the luckless toy of accidental conditions. You cannot impugn the unembarrassed sovereignty of the individual will. That God may surround that will with conditions of life attractive or repellent to the individual's desires is a fact of an entirely different order, and alters not the responsibility of personal choice. Moreover, God "desires not the death of a sinner," and virtue is never repellent to conscience.

They are doubtful servants of the law who talk about the inhumanity of hell; who say it is absurd that God, the God of love and goodness itself, should permit an eternity of torment for human souls. But hell is the work of those who people it. It is no more the work of God or the desire of God than heaven is the work of man. Have the damned not chosen to be damned? Are they not in hell because they hate the God who loved them, and is not the eternity of hell the eternity of their hatred, and can their hatred be aught else than eternal? In this life they knew God, who, in the voice of conscience, called them to Himself. Plainly, they knew that death was the gateway to eternity, an eternity of happy humility before God or of vain pride against Him. Coldly, calmly, they resisted His appeals—and died. In them evil lives as an active principle, ever warring against good, and you can no more love them than you can love the criminal who commences his hell on the scaffold and dies blaspheming God and cursing his judges, or than you can love the evil itself which they have chosen as their everlasting portion. True, hell is the vengeance of God inasmuch as it is when He withdraws Himself from the reprobate that damnation is accomplished, and God and the sinner alone know that frightful hour of final unrepentance.

This life were a very poor comedy if it does not comprehend the responsibility of eternal life or death, and is not our only opportunity for accepting or rejecting that good for whose glory we are created. If this life were not our only opportunity we should not be given light sufficient to be saved. But the saints testify to the abundant and more than sufficient knowledge and help God gives to them who choose Him with confidence and love. If the Eternal Son had never risen from the dead, having lived to example universally the different trials all must undergo to win heaven, having died to take away the sins of the world, then might we turn aside and invent a theory of transmigration of souls to explain the facts of life.

Thus we see how God is the beginning and end of all things.

Knowing Him as the First Cause is the supreme and sufficient proof of His existence. Clearly understood, the argument is irrefragibly convincing. Flawless and completely spherical, its unity and symmetry fitly symbolize the Eternal Being of whom it is the witness to our intelligence.

Let us attempt to describe a so-called scientific and rational opponent of dogmatic religion. He is a man who has deeply questioned his own nature, sounded his affections, his moral instincts, and his carnal impulses. He has analyzed the phenomena of his mental action by an appeal to the involuntary functions of his physical life, questioning digestion, and heart action, and nerve force. He has compared his nature with that of lower orders, from mollusks to elephants, and grimly studied how he is the prey to invisible bacteria. He has applied an intense scrutiny to his social condition, weighing his ethical superiority over animals and savage tribes. And he has even deigned to call upon the seas of history to deliver up their dead that he might scan in the broken skeletons of primeval thought some evidence of a sound scientific reasoning by induction. He fain would rest at times from the interminable labor of passing from primary to secondary and from secondary to tertiary, on and on through the limitless range of the co-ordinate terms of material life whose comparison is ever becoming more difficult by his discovery of unexpected factors of an integral importance, lower in the scale than the point reached, which oblige a weary turning back. Not even in the person of a Herbert Spencer has he found aught evidenced in the study of compelling truths except an "implicit trust that the great evolving movement of things is towards the higher and better," to quote words in the introduction to that writer's "Data of Ethics" Alack, and well-a-day! And has all this mighty inductive gestation and labor of the mountainous scientific method brought forth nothing but a vague "implicit trust?" And does the "implicit trust" satisfy him? At its birth have his labors ceased? No. He lays aside his books, pushes away his microscope, forgets his nerves, forgets friends and all the world, aye, forgets himself, a solitary, throbbing entity in a limitless expanse of thought, as the same old questions present themselves: Who is God; what is God? This is no sentimental appeal to a fancied consciousness of the infinite as of the nature of us. A mere "implicit trust" is negative, and truth is not if it be else than a positive quality, and unless it be that the contrary of truth will satisfy the mind, it naturally follows that no order of thought can yield satisfaction unless it leads to God, who is the very truth. A man searches for truth in physical investigation. The possession of truth only can satisfy him, but,

if he finds it, he will be consciously satisfied. At no time whilst he searches is he more than partially, and even at the end of his search he is not wholly satisfied, or, as far as satisfaction is an absolute term, he is not satisfied at all, and, therefore, he has not found truth. Does it follow from this that truth is not to be found in the study of physics? No. Search with faith and the study of all things will make truth manifest. But faith is rejected by our scientific thinker, and faith comes by a still higher element which this same scientist overlooks, ignores, or what you will. What is this element? It is the inward power which still impelled him when he was aweary, goading him with those awful questions: Who is God? what is God? This inward power is conscience, the inspired intellect, the mind re-energized by the grace of God, as I have elsewhere attempted to metaphysically explain. Faith is commanded because we know it to be a divine inspiration, and it is possible for the free will of man to reject it, hence as grace it comes as the voice of supreme authority. Now, faith is simply the act and the duty of believing the reality of things only remotely knowable to us through evidences in the natural order of our comprehension. Faith is not difficult. Indeed, it is harder to believe the contrary arguments than to believe the proofs we have of God's existence,—proofs all in the order of our understanding, and clearly pointing to a realm of being and power beyond it. Our reason makes us know explicitly that nothing but good is proposed for our acceptance on faith. Reject faith and then look for destruction, for if the mind contemns its own judgments there is no court it will respect. True, a man may be a partial disbeliever, limiting his faith by his own power of analysis; but such a man is very liable to be so busy with the work of his mind, that he does not attempt to limit or define his implicit faith, a gift which, purely of God's goodness, may save many men in spite of themselves. There is hope for the man who neglects the culture of faith, but there is much to fear for him who deliberately rejects a certain testimony and does not hesitate to accept the logical ruin of all revealed law which must follow that rejection. By the deliberate disobedience of a divine inspiration, evil gains a lodgment in the soul, as a man becomes possessed of a devil, and, by the natural law of affinities, evil seeks evil and the man may become the den of any sort of sin that specially fits his temperament, and he is a blasphemer, or an anarchist, or an adulterer, or a murderer, or one of those wretched souls whose curse is indifferentism to all positive thought or feeling, whose moral and intellectual life is automatic, or as though every faculty had been seared by his horrid sin, and an all-pervading blindness encompassed his being. And it may not be urged that, because some men who are without

faith lead good private and public lives, therefore faith is not necessary to the conservation of society and the individual. Not only are a few isolated cases ineffectual to disprove an universal principle, but, besides, that principle is proven by the very constitution of things to be a practical necessity in the life of man. Our knowledge of God is a knowledge requiring reiterated assertion, and reiterated proof by the reason's appeal to the essential idea of a First Cause. Could we eliminate the idea of a First Cause, we should at once eliminate law in the abstract, and, consequently, that concrete body of laws which keeps men from all being criminals and societies from being torn apart by the substitution of might for right and self-interest for justice. Therefore, as far as men know God by faith, looking through faith to Him as being the source of law, it is evident that faith is necessary to the conservation of the individual and of society. It has been shown that free will means independence of law; that is, the law of faith is not a coercive expression of the will of God, as is physical death, and because man is free to disobey it, and yet live, if he pleases, in obedience to subordinate laws of daily life, this is no contradiction of the duty of obeying faith. And, moreover, upon the recognition of this supernatural duty of life clearly depends our right and title, as far as through obedience we may have a right and title, to a future existence, of our hope of which faith is our witness before God, and it plainly follows that, if we reject faith in the future life, we ought by implication to reject faith in the life we lead here, because our knowledge of the future life, except as it is revealed, comes by our knowledge of what constitutes the reality of our present life,—a life no less mysterious to the agnostic than it is to the Christian.

Who is God? What is God? Because you can think the possibility of Him, because you understand the terms describing Him, you know Him by your knowledge of yourself. Your power of mentally conceiving that He may be existent at once places your questioning of His existence in a position of defence, and this is all, perhaps, that we can gain for theism by the argument from consciousness. But it is so much, that we can now advance without fear of the mists of metaphysics which have arisen from the morass of skepticism to veil the sun of Truth from the eyes of men.

It is evident to all men that, however mysterious in themselves and in their action are the powers of the mind, there are certain easily understood physical phenomena which may be used as a basis for reasoning, no less sound because its generalizations while implicitly indicating, yet attempt not to array explicitly the pro-

foundest and most exalted facts of metaphysics. Without penetrating too rashly into the holy mysteries of the soul, it is necessary for us to show what of the soul is the mind and what of the mind are the thinking powers evident to us. Because there are powers and qualities of our bodies of which the most learned physicians know only by phenomena, whose laws of action can be but faintly traced and followed, it is understandable that there are powers and qualities of mind unknown to us except through phenomena, and in the unconscious vitality of which men live.

> "Thou livest in a world of signs and types,
> The presentations of most holy truths,"

but, forget not, O student of the Truth, that thy knowledge can come only by thy reverence for these signs and types; by the deliberate understanding that these signs and types in virtue of what they represent are very real for us; that their reality for this episode of time has all the value of the eternal reality which is to come, because they are the witnesses of it, and, yet, except as they are witnesses of the eternal reality, these signs and types indeed are valueless.

Only force can beget force. We are told that, before we can know the wind is blowing, it must strike upon our cheeks and the nerves of the face will send a message to the brain, or to a special part of it, reporting the rude vibration of the air, and that part of the brain, calling a convention, presents to the assembled nerve delegates from the other lobes the data sent by the facial nerves, and the result is a thought that the wind is blowing. Now, it is of the function of reason to recognize the distinction between cause and effect, and, after the resolution of the simple cognition, that the wind is blowing, is passed, the convention of mental powers at once asks in open session what caused the wind to blow and, thus, with unerring rapidity, the mind reaches back to the idea of a First Cause. Through this power of passing from the rudimentary cognitions, of which we become possessed through the senses, to abstract ideas, we know that abstractions must represent realities of a higher order than mind and matter. If abstractions do not represent such realities, then simple cognitions do not represent realities, because abstract ideas are as real to the mind as simple cognitions and a man is as certainly led to positive actions by justice or honesty, as he is led by a simple cognition when he goes in out of the rain. If a simple cognition lay inert in the mind, like a jewel in a casket, devoid of the active principle of assimilation and growth, then we might say that simple cognitions are the only realities. But, without forgetting the inexorable truth that all knowledge comes only through simple cognitions,

yet, the power of the mind working with simple cognitions to reach above them to abstractions is sufficient testimony to the existence of some hidden principle which in turn is subject to a force, immaterial and superior to the mechanical force which through our senses awakens the activity of the imagination. If the action of the imagination is subject to the action of exterior material influences through the medium of the senses, and, if upon this initial action of the imagination depends the action of the reason then, for imagination and reason to lay hold of any but material subjects of thought, it follows that they must be the powers of a higher principle living through them only as far as the existence of us in this world depends upon the things which are of this world. This does not lead up to the idea of the soul, because we are dealing with the question of thought only, and, therefore, we know that imagination and reason are only powers or exponents of the idea of intellect, which overtops them, and of which even memory is only the humble servant and will the executive ally, and, moreover, all these being the only active spiritual principles of which we are conscious, it is at once understandable that the reality of the mind to which they refer must be passive—the passive intellect. The passive intellect is what we understand of the mind as an attribute of the soul, and we know the soul is all spiritual, subject to spiritual influences and, therefore, the passive intellect is subject to spiritual influences and towards spirituals and as governing its own powers exerts a reactive energy both ways, since both spiritual ideas and cognitions of material realities are subject-matter for the mind's synthetic action. Wherefore, the passive intellect is not passive in the sense of being a Dead Sea of thought amidst whose idly vibrating waves pearls of reason and sapphires of imagination are alike dissolved in a merciless oblivion. What follows? We have shown the imagination and reason to be subordinate to the passive intellect as any part or power of the body is subordinate to the body, and, as the relative energy of any part or power of the body depends upon the general energy of the body, so the relative energy of the imagination and reason as powers of the passive intellect depend upon the general energy of the passive intellect. Thus the activity of reason in assimilating the simple cognitions presented by the imaginations, depends upon the material vigor of the passive intellect, and, as this activity of the reason is greater or less, so is a man more or less spiritual, *i.e.*, superanimal, the mental life of animals being simply the continuous apprehension of sterile cognitions. Now we are led to the question,—"Whence comes its vitality and energy to the passive intellect?" There can be no answer, except we say, "From God."

This is what Christians mean by inspiration.

Of course we know, besides inspiration, a different power of life in virtue of God's original endowment of human nature with the power of thought, and, in human natnre itself, and the world around, His provision of the subject-matter for thought; and the mind thus constituted requires no replenishing with divine energy in order to fulfil its temporal destiny, but, of its created nature, lives, moves, and has its being continuously. But this dignity of natural endowment is limited and impaired by sin; wherefore, we understand that we must be the objects of immediate inspiration; the pouring out upon the child of His love, of God's free and unmeritable gift of goodness, in virtue of which we, who are "born children of wrath," are made capable of thoughts of humility, of obedience, of charity, and are given knowledge and wisdom concerning immaterial things, in short, are enabled to know, to think about, to love, honor, and obey the true God from whose blessed vision Adam and all mankind were banished. But, though banished as an abiding and unfailing enlightenment, as a gift so exalted that in virtue of it man was worthy of the friendship of God, yet, since the passive goodness of our nature was not expelled by the Fall, and since our free will did not irrevocably choose evil, therefore, we still are capable of receiving the power of divine grace, and of profiting by it, if we elect to correspond with, instead of disobeying, its promptings. We should not presume to question the measure of this gift as bestowed upon one or another, because God gives Himself at His will; but from the facts of life we know the truth of what he says: "I love them that love Me, and in the early morning watch for Me."

If we thus know God's will to be the impelling energy of all good thoughts, outside of and above the natural thoughts which are good as of the inferior good which still holds of humanity, does it not follow that He must inspire evil thoughts, else, whence come evil thoughts? As we have seen, the essence of moral evil is disobedience of law, of God's will; that is, evil is a negation, not an active, self-existent principle, as is good, but, coming about by the free will of man denying the inspiration of God, which must, of His nature, always be good. Thus, we have two forces influencing the spiritual life—the inspiration of God, and the free will of man, and evil is the opposition of the latter to the former. Certainly, action must be progressive or retrogressive. The life of the mind cannot be thought to be an invariable phenomenon, like a diamond's reflection of light, or the unfluctuating intensity of a seraph's ecstacy before the Throne. This life on earth has for its first element an unceasing struggle of the soul towards spiritual perfection, or by its fatal choice of evil a horrid haste

from God, whose mercy may encompass the sinner even to the gates of death, when at last the choice must be made between eternal good or eternal evil. If he will a man may so reject grace that he sinks to a condition of intellectual torpor as he follows a career of sensuality; or, he may engage in a restless, hopeless conflict against the testimony of conscience, scorning in pride the sacredness of natural and revealed law. But if he is faithful, he will fulfil the destiny allotted him by divine goodness and live truly, in the sense of advancing, from generation to generation, of races, and from day to day of the individual's life, to a keener, ever deeper apprehension and understanding of the illimitable attributes of God, as in this temporal existence they surround us, dimly reflected in the effulgent skies, the happy earth and, above all, in the mysterious dignities of our own nature, the special object of His infinite care.

Religion is love and obedience of law, but, as we cannot be expected to love and obey a law of which we are ignorant, it follows that religion holds primarily of knowledge. It is certainly no abstruse or finely spun principle—though fine spinning is not contrary to the spirit of truth—that since knowledge is the basis of religion, and we are naturally endowed with the powers of acquiring knowledge, therefore a man's religiousness depends finally upon his good will to acquire knowledge and upon his good will to correspond with the obligations imposed by the knowledge he acquires. But, moreover, knowledge is manifold, and no man is capable of acquiring all knowledge. Now, since good will, primarily, and knowledge, secondarily, are the natural terms controlling the idea of salvation to a future life of happiness, the reason and object of religion, what must we infer as of the essence of religion as it holds of different souls? We must infer that since there is a difference in degree of good will between different men, and since our understandings are greater or less in capacity for knowledge, therefore, in the first place, there are degrees, not of salvation, which is an incomparable idea, but of the gifts of salvation, and, in the second place, either chance controls the extent of the powers of the different men to acquire knowledge, or else the individual's powers are the expression of a supreme will, and this must be; God is, and His is the Supreme Will, the existence of which controverts the idea of chance, the contrary of will.

Now, we cannot think of the Will of God unless as the Source of Law; and it is an universal will, and law, therefore, is universal, which shows us that law, generically, and laws specifically speaking, must control our knowledge of truth. It is of the nature of truth that truths are of greater or less importance; that is, one

truth may implicitly contain and of the order of its importance control other truths subordinate to it, and all truths, as of the whole body of truth must act co-ordinately and interdependently. This being so, it is evident that, to a right understanding of truth, truths should be known, as one holds of another, and the majestic sequence of lesser truths to greater must be scientifically fixed in order that no integral factor shall be dropped by reason of a faulty knowledge of its interdependence with other truths. This is an analysis of the principle of dogma; a dogma being simply a truth of an importance so great that a right understanding of subordinate and co-ordinate truths affecting the faith and morals of the people is dependent upon it, wherefore it is solemnly affirmed by authority. I have said that a solemn affirmation of a truth by authority erects it to the dignity of a dogma, and this is because authority is necessary to compel a universally right understanding of a truth which immediately or remotely must impose a moral obligation. In this way we know that the authority of God must be manifested to men in order that they may be moved to respect obligations which are only obligations of man to man as they are in the first place, obligations of man to God. But, if the authority of God shall be manifested to man, it must be in a way so clear that his understanding is satisfied, and with a form so impressive that his will is moved.

Is the authority of God so manifested?

My dear friend, you are as familiar as I am with the story of the Lord Jesus Christ. The verity of the facts is not in question, unless you impugn the divinity of the Son of God. Your doubt of that fact will be dispelled in due time, unless you persist in questioning the divinity of the author of a divine work; for the Christian Church, if it be not divine, must be shown to be a congeries of purely human forces, held together by the treacherous cohesion of human policy and wisdom. We have shown that the authority of God should be plainly manifested, if it be that man owes any duty to God. I maintain as an inexorable outcome of all that is proven of God, that His Church must be, and I maintain of His Church, that it cannot be, if it is not one, holy, Catholic and apostolic, in the sense in which these marks are evident in the body of them who acknowledge the Vicar of Christ, the Bishop of Rome.

It were insufficient and inaccurate to consider the existence of God as an isolated fact. God without the Church would avail nothing to mankind. It were useless for men to know of God's existence as of the existence of one who cared not for them. We cannot think of Him except as the source of law, but this title were a mockery if He claimed not obedience to His laws, or, if

claiming it, He set up no statute defining them. Nor would it avail if having set up His statute He appointed no officers to administer it; or, if having appointed the officers, He left them to interpret the statute according to their fancy, instituting no order of authority among them and giving them no invariable criterion of principle, justifying the established order and in virtue of which principle should be maintained among them a vigorous legislative and executive existence, an existence co-ordinate with and perfectly adapted to human nature, in common with which it shares the element of growth, the noblest gift of rational being. But, of what avail would be papal infallibility, this invariable criterion of principle, if it had only the dead letter force of a law cut off from its source? What sort of God would He be, if He gave all these things and denied us Himself, saying as it were, to poor fallen humanity: "Here are the seeds of heavenly harvests; let human souls receive them; they contain the inert principle of eternal life, but the vivifying showers of my grace, the sunlight of my presence I deny you?" Here is the whole theory of Christianity, in its briefest terms, God, and God with us. There can be no God, if there is no certain guide acting under His immediate inspiration; no authoritative witness of Him, by which men may know Him, be persuaded to love Him and commanded to serve Him.

The highest legislative function of the church is the utterance of dogma, and her highest executive function is administration of the sacraments. How of her constitution these acts are essential to her being and how of her constitution these acts must be infallibly true we need not here attempt to explain. The constitution of the Church is a study in itself. Acknowledge the fact of the Church as proven by the existence of God, recognize the need of a Church to put humanity in communion with divinity and then examine as deeply as you may, the constitution of the church in itself, and the peculiarity of its office.

Before we can explain the Church as the only means by which our Lord should choose to put humanity in communion with divinity we must explain the necessity of His coming at all, or to institute a church. Let it not be said that it is unworthy of God to need to be propitiated, to have His anger appeased because of the offences of men. It were not unbecoming of God that we should suppose Him incapable of anger as we know it in ourselves. He is the God of love, not of wrath; but this question of atonement and of propitiation by sacrifice is not a question concerning God as He is in Himself, but it is a question concerning Him as He is in humanity's understanding of Him. A corrupt humanity cannot be appealed to by a law of love alone. God did not, does not prefer to threaten His vengeance against the dis-

obedient children of earth, but He would certainly be unwise if He suffered sin and forgave it, forgave the constant disobedience of His explicitly revealed law without the sinner even asking forgiveness or offering to undergo or expecting to have inflicted any punishment for his crime. Justice is the maintenance of law. Punishment is the vindication of the dogmatic force of law. Law would have no meaning without the auxiliary ideas of justice and expiation, and reparation. Propitiation as such, is only a type or earnest of man's sincere desire of forgiveness; it is simply a witness of his contrition. As for atonement, it holds of justice and is higher than propitiation, for by atonement evil is made barren, its bitter fruit is superseded by the good of the act of atonement.

Thus evil, as disobedience of a law, the expressed will of God, interrupts the action of that law as far as the law concerns the sinner, or those whom his sin affects; the growth of goodness is stopped; but, when he is repentant the sinner has at once a new duty to perform in trying, by a more active correspondence of his will with divine law, to compensate for the good lost by his sin having interrupted the action of good within him, or without him in so far as his sin concerned others. The correspondence of the human will with the divine is not only the highest conception we can form of goodness as it relates to us, but also, it shows goodness to be a living, expanding, positive quality. In this way we at once understand the necessity for an Universal Redeemer whose act of sacrifice alone could adequately atone for the sin of Adam, a sin interrupting the action of good in the whole human race, wherefore the propitiation and atonement on Calvary were both so necessary to satisfy the divine justice that without this sacrifice of God Himself no individual propitiation and atonement could have merit. In this way is indubitably explained the reason for the incarnation of the Son of God, and all the facts of religion dependent on that greatest act of God's love for men. But, that He was made flesh, was born, preached, was persecuted, crucified, died, rose from the dead, ascended to the right hand of the Father and sent thence the Holy Ghost, was not only that He should atone for original sin but also that He might institute a means whereby all men to come shall know that He hath done these things and that salvation awaits them who believe and acknowledge Him to be the Son of God.

Law, in the sense of unvarying conditions, is plainly evident in this, our own order of being, and it is reasonable that, unless a supernatural necessity for contradicting it prevails, God respects the expression of His own will by respecting the laws of our being in this state where He has placed us. In this way we understand the existence of a visible church to be a necessity of the condition

of things. In other words, as has been said elsewhere, all knowledge must come through the senses, the mind passing from simple cognitions to the apprehension and understanding of abstractions; therefore, unless God were pleased to operate a miracle in favor of every soul and give it supernaturally all knowledge necessary to salvation, it must be that He has instituted some visible and auricular means of providing mankind with knowledge of Him and of His law.

It is not repugnant to the idea of His goodness that there are some who are born and die without the Gospel, and therefore are deprived of that high measure of goodness to be won only through hearing and heeding the Gospel, because this evil is not the fault of God but it is the fault of man, who in the person of the progenitor of all men, Adam, turned his will against God; but yet, unless by original sin all good and will to good went out of mankind, there are individuals among the heathen who, by obedience to natural law, attain salvation, the gifts of which in their case, however, must reasonably be supposed to be immensely inferior to the Heavenly gifts awaiting the Christian believer.

Commence where we may in philosophical research, a conscientious advance always confronts us with the idea of will as the centre of the whole sidereal system of human thought. Development of the idea of will shows it to be the most direct connection between God and the souls of men. The affections of men, their love of this or that, is their voluntary inclination towards objects of affection. That is, love of God means the voluntary obedience of men to His law; because His law being the expression of His supreme will, and to love being a law, loving is the yielding of the will of men to the will of God. Human love is a conflict, or at its best, an affirmative action of human will. The subtle attraction between lovers is God's law, and in their sweet and willing yielding, marriage holily symbolizes that wondrous affirmative action of individual wills of which our highest conception is the servant of God "running" joyously "in the way of His commandments" and, as through a golden veil, discerning the very loveliness of His person in the reflected glory of His law. The action of loving is simple. In human affection, to be sure, love hesitates and errs, since human nature is fallen and we are drawn towards unworthy objects or fail of goodness ourselves, but insomuch as we have the will to love God, loving is the simplest action of life. What is more simple than to know that God is all goodness, that only goodness can come from Him, and therefore obey His law with all our will? Moreover, we are born with the disposition to love; this is God's will in the natural order, and the more we love the better are our minds enlightened and the more do we understand

the right of God to command love. Love scarce may know itself in these high words, but this same sublime love buds and blooms in every honest soul who follows every day goodness, even though to the word God he may pay only the formal homage of religious fear.

Weigh well, ye skeptics, the philosophical axiom that will is superior to understanding. Herein lies your error, fatal fruit of some first act of disobedience, that ye reject God's law of love. Cure yourselves by loving. Give over your endless weaving of vain subtleties, and remember that wisdom walks not hand in hand with knowledge. She comes direct from the holy place on high, she who is "more precious than rubies," and she is God's gift to His loving servants alone.

I feel it were needless, my dear friend, to attempt more for you than to clearly identify the Hope of Mankind, the *anchora spei* of true religion. I cling to the facts of true religion because it is as evidently a means of safety as an iron anchor would be to a drifting ship—an anchor which, having the form of one, and actually holding fast the tossing soul against the waves of doubt and affliction, I willingly accept as being of the real nature of an anchor, without questioning how far the base alloy of unwise human discipline or a false tempering on the historian's forge may impugn the technical accuracy of title by which this mystical anchor claims our allegiance. In point of fact, sufficient labor will discover the true title in the Divine Maker's stamp, even without the test of revolutionary fire out of which the metal comes, time and time again, in all its pristine purity and strength. If this allegory is true, and we think it is, it vindicates well enough the implicit faith of all those who, by reason of lacking high endowment or opportunity, are prevented from understanding the proofs of religion more deeply than their crude reasonings explain for them the testimony of deeper things in the outward forms and customs of Church teaching. Moreover, the spirit of the Church is catholic; of its divine constitution, in the infallible truth of its different functions it is especially fitted to reach the hearts of all, and to men infinitely various in intelligence and good will it speaks an universal language; the miracle of tongues is daily operated through its sacred ministry by the Holy Ghost, who, not in flames, but in the Bread of Life, comes to teach and console and command the subjects of the heavenly kingdom. Philosophize as deeply as you may, there is no solution for the mystery of death except Christian faith, a teaching which not only robs the grave of its victory, but makes the life of the most afflicted and infirm a life wherein joy more abounds than sorrow, and lightheartedness than pain.

As for her, the Catholic Church, the Mystical Spouse of Christ, the Pearl of great price, the kingdom of God on earth, let me write down for you the panegyric of her penned by Cardinal Newman, whom I would most fondly emulate for piety and wisdom: "There is but one form of Christianity, my brethren, possessed of that real internal unity which is the primary condition of independence. Whether you look to Russia, England or Germany, this note of divinity is wanting. In this country especially (England) there is nothing broader than class religions; the established form itself is but the religion of a class. There is one persuasion for the rich and another for the poor; men are born in this or that sect; the enthusiastic go here, and the sober-minded and rational go there. They make money, and rise in the world, and then they profess to belong to the Establishment. This body lives in the world's smile, that in its frown; the one would perish of cold in the world's winter, and the other would melt away in the summer. Not one of them undertakes human nature; none compass the whole man; none places all men on a level; none addresses the intellect and the heart, fear and love, the active and the contemplative. It is considered, and justly, as an evidence for Christianity that the ablest men have been Christians; not that all sagacious or profound minds have taken up its profession, but that it has gained victories among them, such and so many, as to show that it is not the mere fact of ability or learning which is the reason why all are not converted. Such, too, is the characteristic of Catholicity; not the highest in rank, not the meanest, not the most refined, not the rudest, is beyond the influence of the Church; she includes specimens of every class among her children. She is the solace of the forlorn, the chastener of the prosperous, and the guide of the wayward. She keeps a mother's eye for the innocent, bears with a heavy hand upon the wanton, and has a voice of majesty for the proud. She opens the mind of the ignorant, and she prostrates the intellect of the most gifted. These are not words; she has done it, she does it still, she undertakes to do it. All she asks is an open field and freedom to act. She asks no patronage from the civil power; in former times and places she has asked it; and, as Protestantism also, has availed herself of the civil sword. . . . . But her history shows that she needed it not, for she has extended and flourished without it. She is ready for any service which occurs; she will take the world as it comes; nothing but force can repress her. See, my brethren, what she is doing in this country now? For three centuries the civil power has trodden down the goodly plant of grace and kept its foot upon it; at length, circumstances have removed that tyranny, and lo! the fair form of the Ancient Church rises up at once, as fresh and as vigorous as if she

had never intermitted her growth. She is the same as she was three centuries ago, ere the present religions of the country existed; you know her to be the same; it is the charge brought against her that she does not change; time and place affect her not, because she has her source where there is neither time nor place, because she comes from the throne of the Illimitable, Eternal God."

God be praised!

The Argument of Affirmation.

It is easy to understand that the abstract condition of unity is a supreme or peculiar condition which precludes its contrary, of fractions which cannot be imagined as personal entities. This applies to any concrete application of the principle we may choose. Unity, oneness, is the peculiarity of things which, if broken or divided, lose this supreme characteristic. Body and soul are one man, and if death annihilated the body, personality, the unity, the oneness of each man would cease beyond the grave, and we could imagine nothing but a vague, generic humanity. Therefore, if we make unity a test of truth in a certain case, we have only to prove unity in order to prove truth, and, by implication, prove falsehood of the condition of impersonal fractions. In other words, to prove the condition, A, to be right is to prove its contrary, B, to be wrong. This explains the affirmative temper of Christian philosophy. The Christian philosophy is synthetic, and prefers to defend dogma by lucid definitions rather than by querulous analysis of the contrary positions assumed by heretical thinkers.

Our non-Catholic friends cry out against us that we are ignorant of their various cultures; that we ought to read their sides of the question—put ourselves, as it were, in their positions, to share, as one of them too aptly suggested, a common danger, as in rescuing a man from a frozen river we must walk on thin ice and jeopardize our own lives also. Why should we? We are willing to apply every test of historical inquiry, and prefer the honest testimony of the opposite party; we are willing to hear the testimony of honest physicians, and have no fear of any metaphysical truth; but we refuse to stultify our own intelligence, and substitute self-reliance for faith and criticism for infallible authority. What have we to do with the reasonings of negation? What have we to do with the painful digests of men who attack, or condemn, or ridicule truths which we have tested and are testing by affirmative analysis? Unless it can be proved that faith is sustained, hope is nourished, and charity is made to abound by the principle of negative analysis, we cannot be persuaded to turn about and prove the truth of Christian dogma by laboring as "devil's advocate."

Let us appeal to unity of doctrine, one of the notes of the Church, whereby is meant a logical consistency in all the teachings of Christianity. Unity is almost a self-evident proof of truth; for time-serving Erastianism, a shifting of creeds to suit human passions and ambitions, a teaching of any one principle as essential now and non-essential then, an irresoluteness of meaning concerning essential things which leaves at variance persons of nominally the same communion; surely, these things are not unity; surely, they are not reconcilable with the idea of inflexible law, the revealed will of God; and surely, the Church is nothing if she does not speak with the infallible certitude and authority of her divine spouse, Jesus Christ. Wherefore, if we can prove such a thing as unity, as a test of truth for Catholic Christianity, we have proved the falsehood of all teaching contrary to Catholic dogma.

"L'Eglise catholique n'est point argumentatrice de sa nature; elle croit sans disputer, car *la foi est une croyance par amour*, et l'amour n'argumente point."—*De Maistre.*

Adrian Worthington Smith.

CATHOLIC TENDENCY IN AMERICAN LITERATURE.

A CONGREGATIONAL minister of our acquaintance, not long ago, proposed to form, in the city where he lives, a literary club from which religion and politics should be excluded. This, it appears to us, would be just about as reasonable and satisfactory as to organize a society for the study of physiology, and then exclude from it all consideration of the heart and the brain.

For, there can be no literature with any sort of vitality in it, that does not contain or imply the writer's views of religion, whether for or against, doctrinal or diffused, conscious or unconscious. Not even the lighter poets or novelists—those among them, at least, who are worth considering at all—can wholly avoid showing or suggesting, here and there, what principles of sociology and government inhabit their minds; that is, principles of politics, not in the partisan, but in the philosophic sense; and the same is true, in various degrees, as to other kinds of literature. In fact, no argument is needed to prove that these two great elements are so inwoven with the whole fabric of thought and expression that the study of literature, leaving them out, must be a superficial one. Nevertheless, there is, among non-Catholic critics and essayists, a tendency to regard and to discuss literature precisely in this way; to analyze the outer shell rather than the inner substance.

No doubt, it is because of this tendency that in all the histories or surveys of American literature, which have come to our notice, there is a strange lack of central, comprehensive views—an absence of proportion. To understand a literature, we must be able to measure it by principles larger and deeper than the literature itself, or than ourselves.

Now, since Catholics at least have the means for such measurement, we should try to apply them; and, by way of guiding-thread at the outset, a singular fact connected with the mariner's compass may be recalled, the bearing of which will soon become clear.

We are accustomed to think of the magnetic needle as always pointing absolutely to the north. But, in fact, it varies all the time. What is called "magnetic declination" causes it to change, little by little, the angle at which it stands to the geographical meridian. First, it moves to the eastward, continuing in that direction for a long period of time; after which it slowly swings back "into true," as we may say, until it once more points due north, like the meridian line itself. Then, it begins to lean away again; but, this time,

westward until, at last, it points as much as twenty-four degrees to the west of north. When it has reached that wide angle of divergence, it reverts again gradually to the east. Thus the compass-needle oscillates, like a pendulum; but slowly,—too slowly for us to perceive the motion at any one time. From its extreme western to its extreme eastern inclination it swings only once in three hundred and twenty years.

Much the same is it with the drift or tendency of a national literature. Some great influence—always more or less mysterious—may be controlling such a literature and causing it to point in one general direction; although, when examined at some particular moment, it will be found to diverge considerably from that line. If our study of this divergence includes a wide enough range of time and place, we shall discover that the variance, the oscillations, are merely incidental to one permanent and ruling tendency.

Whoever looks for the first time at the scattered products of colonial American writers, may, perhaps, be at a loss to find in them any common aim or far-reaching inspiration. Of genius or fine artistry, we must confess, they showed little. But, let us note a few of those works. New England's later fame in authorship has led most people to take it for granted that American literature began in Massachusetts. This is not the fact. Its beginning was in Virginia, where, in 1607, more than a dozen years before the Pilgrims touched Plymouth Rock, sturdy Captain John Smith, world-famous through the Pocahontas legend, composed that graphic volume known as "A True Relation of Virginia." There, too, George Sandys completed his poetic translation of Ovid's "Metamorphoses," a fabric of elegant scholarship that still survives in good repute; and William Strachey, the Secretary of Virginia, wrote in that colony, although it was printed in London, his powerful narrative of the wreck, on the Bermudas, of the *Sea-Adventure*, Sir Thomas Gates's vessel, in which the author himself had sailed for America. This book, done in 1610, is, with some reason—on account of its vivid description of a Bermudan storm—supposed to have given Shakespeare hints for "The Tempest," the scene of which was laid near "the vexed Bermoothes." The list of Southern writings at that time is not a long one. Yet it includes an account of the arrival of the Maryland colonists, written in Latin by the Jesuit Father Andrew White, who expressed the hope that in this new land there would "be sown not so much the seeds of grain and fruit-trees as of religion and piety." The spirit of that hope was full of significance. For it did not mean that agriculture and thrift should be neglected, but that religious principles should be cultivated still more; indeed, first of all.

The missions of the Jesuits and other priests, in central New

York and the West, the story of which, a Protestant writer has declared—"is as marvellous as a tale of chivalry or legends of the lives of saints;" Father Jogue's martyrdom among the Mohawks; the discoveries, the devoted spirit of Champlain, and his roughly-written, truthful books; the "Relations" and Journals of the Jesuits, describing their work among Indians from 1630 till nearly 1700; the pathetic episode of Père Marquette's death in Michigan; the herculean journeys of De la Salle down the Ohio, the Mississippi, and in Texas; and Joliet's expedition—all these things, likewise, really form part of the material of American literature. Their record, though made in French, belongs to the New World, and has been largely incorporated in our later histories; notably, those of Francis Parkman, who—though prejudiced against Rome, and not in sympathy with Catholic faith—has given his life to the narration of these noble events in books of rare vivacity, charm and force. Parkman, looking upon the French-American pioneers as opposed to civil and religious liberty, thinks that the Jesuits were providentially massacred by Iroquois Indians, and that the disasters which befell the French in attempting to secure inland America were a providential aid to the triumph of New England. This is to take but a short-sighted view of American history. Catholic explorers found the heart of this country, they traced its great artery in the Mississippi; Catholic priests alone were able to Christianize and partially civilize the red men; and they marked a vast territory with the sign of the cross. Material power, except in Louisiana, vanished from the nation to which these missionaries happened to belong; but the sign of the cross will remain where they placed it forever.

Although, according to the words of Parkman, the Puritans "in defiance of the four Gospels" made the pursuit of gain a duty, and linked "thrift and godliness in equivocal wedlock,"—still, they too, were animated by a pious zeal of their own. It is important to note that in Massachusetts, as in Catholic Maryland and the western missions, the dominant idea was that of the supremacy of religion; just as the master-motive of Columbus, in making his great voyage of discovery, was to bring new countries and heathen populations under the dominion of Christianity. So, then, we get the first trace of a consistent purpose or element in American literature, which might naturally be expected to reappear later on. America, discovered, was like a land new born, the child of Christendom. Never before had a vast country been thus occupied and developed distinctly as a province added to the Christian realm. The religious idea floated like a banner above the invading multitude; no matter what the private faults or unworthy motives of individuals here and there might be.

The colony on Manhattan Island perhaps was an exception; having then, as New York city has now, a trait of cosmopolite worldliness; so receptive to impressions and influences from all sides, as to run some risk of becoming indifferent or fickle. Yet, though disclosing little of ideal aspiration, New York had her strong literary politician, Morris of Morrisania, and Cadwallader Colden, *savant* and historian. Pennsylvania, founded by the gentle Quakers, who were shrewdly gainful of earthly goods, still kept the honor of God to the fore. George Fox, the originator of Quakerism, conceived that man could get wisdom enough from the inner light; and on the theory that "God stood in no need of human learning," held that man did not need it either. Hence he looked down on intellectual culture. But William Penn and his associates, being educated and studious, one of their first cares was to set up schools in Pennsylvania; and accordingly Philadelphia unfolded a literary spirit. Wherever men of intellectual habit went, with school and printing press, literary expression followed inevitably.

Such men were the framers of New England, who had received much training within certain lines of thought. They did not come here to spread religious freedom, but—as their acts and annals show and historians admit—they sought liberty of worship for themselves alone, where they could forbid an equal liberty to every one else. Their policy toward the Indians, whom the Rev. John Eliot alone among them tried to convert, was aggressive. They established an austere, iron-bound theocracy, which permitted slavery, in the holding of compulsory bondmen, and was absolutely intolerant in matters religious. It was perhaps the closest, most rigorous union of church and state the modern world has seen. No man in their colony could be a land owner and voter, unless he conformed to the Puritan tenets; and Puritan ministers were practically the government. Nevertheless, within their bounds, they fostered the germ of self-government, which afterward broke down the barrier of exclusion and spread far beyond the original nursery. The strong convictions, powerful character and studiousness of their preachers, also, brought forth an energetic literature of sermons and histories, which, although dull reading to the average man or woman now, had striking qualities of earnestness and sincerity. Moreover, it is a mistake to suppose, because the Puritans frowned upon art, that they forbade poetry. On the contrary, the first book actually *printed* in America was a version of the Psalms, made by them and issued at Cambridge, 1640. It was, in a sort, metrical, but not rhythmic; as witness this from the 63d Psalm (62d of the Douay Bible):

"When as that I remembrance have
Of thee my bed upon,
And on thee in the night watches
Have meditation."

Magistrates, grave divines and staid matrons, as Prof. Moses Coit Tyler points out, universally gave way to the verse-writing mania. They allowed themselves this one artistic indulgence of poetry; perhaps only for the reason that they did not know what true poetry was. At any rate, the chief musician of New England was Anne Bradstreet, a governor's wife; called "the Tenth Muse," and with entire propriety—since no one would ever have recognized her as having anything to do with the original Nine. Here is a sample of her utterance on the Four Ages of Man:

"Lo, now four other act upon the stage,
Childhood and youth, the Manly and Old Age:
The first, son unto phlegm, grandchild to water,
Unstable, supple, cold and moist's his nature.
The third of fire and choler is composed,
Vindicative and quarrelsome dispos'd.
The last, of earth and heavy melancholy,
Solid, hating all lightness and all folly."

But what we had meant to dwell upon here, was the mastery with which religion held these New England forefathers. Their zeal made them morose, intolerant, often unjust and tyrannical. It even tainted the devoutness of their attitude towards God. For, in their hatred of the Catholic faith of *their* forefathers, they actually abolished the observance of Christmas. Think of a body of people professing to be Christians and to believe the divinity of our Lord, yet allowing their hearts and minds to become so warped by human resentment, that they actually dishonored and ignored the natal day of Christ on earth! Yet we must credit them with obeying sincerely, though in a mistaken manner, their conscience. It is *the power of conscience* in the Puritan mind which, above all, has left its impress on their literature and much of our civilization, and deserves respect.

Perhaps there is no example of this, more touching and instructive than the behavior of Samuel Sewall, chief-justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Court near the end of the seventeenth century. Sewall was learned, upright, brave. He was the first to urge the abolition of slavery in New England. Women should think kindly of him; for he took up their cause in a point of importance. One day, in a book called "The British Apollo," he read this slightly ungrammatical question: "Is there now, or will there be at the resurrection any females in heaven; since there seems to be no need of them there?" Sewall's chivalry, being aroused, he wrote a

treatise to prove that the souls of women *would* be saved. "If," he contended, "there were no need of women in heaven, by the same argument there could be no men; since God really has no need of any creature." This is perfectly sound. And his conclusion was equally sound, that "There are three women that shall rise again,—Eve, the mother of all living; Sarah, the mother of the faithful; and Mary, the mother of our Lord. And if these three rise again, without doubt all will." The passage is worth remembering; for it shows that although the Blessed Virgin was deprived of all outward honor and reverence among the Puritans, they could not banish reverence for her from their hearts. But the special proof of Sewall's loyalty to conscience was this: he presided at some of the witchcraft trials, and condemned certain innocent persons to death. Five years later, convinced that he had done wrong, he wrote a confession of his error and caused it to be read publicly in church. Here we have an example of the power of the Puritan conscience and, even more emphatically, a Puritan acknowledgement of the necessity of confession, which later Protestants completely deny.

As the Quaker poet Whittier has written of him:

> "Green forever the memory be
> Of the Judge of the old Theocracy,
> Whom even his errors glorified,
> Like a far-seen, sunlit mountain-side,
> By the cloudy shadows which o'er it glide!"

The Puritan conscience did not always work so wholesomely; as, for instance, when it caused Quakers to be tied naked to the tail of a cart, and whipped from Salem to Boston; and as when Cotton Mather (one of the present writer's ancestors) having been active in persecuting those accused of witchcraft, or at least keeping up a morbid excitement about them, was afterward reproached, and apparently suffered compunctions, but could not quite bring himself to humble confession; claiming credit, rather, for the attention he had given the "afflicted," with a view to saving their souls. This was a case of conscience wandering in the labyrinth of pride. Yet it is interesting to observe that Mather, from early youth even to the end, kept frequent fasts and vigils. He desired to resemble a rabbi mentioned in the Talmud, whose face was black by reason of fasting. Once in his old age he abstained from all food three days together, and spent the time as he expressed it, in "knocking at the door of Heaven." He also had minute rules for devout thought. "When he put out his candle (his son tells us, in his biography), it must be done with an address to the Father of Lights, that *his* light might not be put out in ob-

scure darkness." "When he washed his hands he must think of the clean hands, as well as pure heart, which belong to the citizens of Zion." And even when he had toothache, he considered whether he had not sinned with his teeth—by excessive eating, or by evil speeches in which the tongue touched the teeth. This decidedly savors of scruple. Yet the custom of associating pious thoughts and meditation with every-day actions was one directly drawn from Catholic practice.

Here we must take a long leap, from those early days, to the period following the American Revolution. The writings of the early settlers made no great literary impression on the rest of the world. Even now, what they did is more important to us than what they wrote. After their time, the religious element in our general literature took what would now be called, in common phrase, a "back seat." The first American to win renown in Europe as an author was Benjamin Franklin, whom the skeptic, David Hume, welcomed in 1762 as "the first great man of letters for whom we are beholden" to America. As the author of "Poor Richard's" prudential maxims, and later of his famous "Autobiography," his fame spread far and quickly. Great was the honor paid him as an exponent of purely common sense philosophy, a pioneer in electricity, a sturdy patriot and brilliant diplomatist. In the Metropolitan Museum, New York, you will find a large collection of portraits and images of him, on paper, in metal, in porcelain, gathered from all countries of the earth. You will see him figured as a German, a Frenchman, a Chinese Mandarin; as everything except a saint. And he was not a saint—even figuratively. Mr. Julian Hawthorne gives us perhaps the best short estimate of Franklin, when he says: "He lacked the instinct of reverence; he was unspiritual; he was insensible to the sublime; grace and taste were not in him; irreligious he was not, though he was as far as possible from sounding the depths of religious experience so familiar to his contemporary, Jonathan Edwards. He formulated a creed to the effect that there is a God, that men should help one another, and that evil will bring its penalties; and a code of moral rules, which is really the expression of the shape which his practical experience of vice had given to Franklin's character. Obviously there were heights that he could never reach."

Franklin, with other students of natural science who had become numerous in this country by the middle of the last century, developed what has been called "a sturdy rational spirit." But the rational spirit alone does not suffice for the guiding of national thought and letters. Franklin represented only the "practical" side of American nature; called practical because it leaves out the ideal. His influence has long since waned, as everything materi-

alistic is bound to wane. After the first quarter of the nineteenth century, we come to a loftier order of writing. Great poets and novelists, and even the fairly good ones, usually present, by means of their imaginative insight, something that points clearly toward the pole-star of truth and directs them in their wanderings, even though they may be quite adrift and at sea. As the blatant irreligion and illogicalness of "Tom" Paine, during the revolutionary period, reasserts itself in the unreasoning bluster of "Bob" Ingersoll—which we may call the philosophy of immaturity, or of calf-like undevelopment—so the mundane and unspiritual mood of Franklin has recurred latterly in scientific writers, historians and philosophic essayists. But equally, and perhaps even more strongly, the religious sentiment has made itself manifest in many of our modern authors.

We know how Longfellow, Unitarian and unbeliever though he remained, drank at Catholic sources of art and poetry. He showed this crudely in his "Midnight Mass for the Dying Year." In the riper poem on "Nüremberg," visiting the Church of St. Lawrence, he sings:

> "Here, when art was still religion, with a simple, reverent heart,
> Lived and labored Albrecht Dürer, the evangelist of art;"—

Dürer, the wonderful designer and engraver of illustrations of the Passion of our Lord! In Longfellow, too, there seems to have dwelt a life-long desire to identify his own art in some way with religion. His purpose in writing *The Golden Legend* was, as he said, to show "that through the darkness and corruption of the Middle Ages ran a bright, deep stream of faith, strong enough for all the exigencies of life and death." Père Gratry once summed up the difference between society in the Middle Ages and that of our latest centuries, in these words: "Society then was Catholic and sustained men above themselves, but now society is Catholic no longer, and drags men downward with itself." Accepting this as true, we shall not quite agree with Longfellow about the darkness of the Middle Ages. But when he speaks of the "bright, deep stream of faith," it is *our* faith that he means; and to it he pays some beautiful tributes, in this versified story of the mediæval time; as when the child Elsie, proposing to sacrifice her own life for another, says:

> "Do I not know
> The life of woman is full of woe?"—

and her mother answers:

> "It is the malediction of Eve."

Thereupon Elsie replies:

> "In place of it, let me receive
> The benediction of Mary, then."

Exactly the Catholic idea, that the Blessed Virgin is the second, or the sinless Eve! Again, Prince Henry says to Elsie:

> "O pure in heart, from thy sweet dust shall grow
> Lilies, upon whose petals will be written
> 'Ave Maria,' in characters of gold!"

And, once more, on another point, Prince Henry exclaims:

> "God's blessing on the architects who build
> The bridges o'er swift rivers and abysses
> Before impassable to human feet,
> No less than on the builders of cathedrals,
> Whose massive walls are bridges thrown across
> The dark and terrible abyss of Death.
> Well has the name of Pontifex been given
> Unto the Church's head, as the chief builder
> And architect of the invisible bridge
> That leads from earth to Heaven."

Still further, approaching Italy, he says:

> "This is indeed the Blessed Mary's land;
> All hearts are touched and softened at her name,
> And even as children who have much offended
> So men, repenting of their evil deeds,
> Offer to her their prayers and their confession,
> And she for them in Heaven makes intercession.
> And if our Faith had given us nothing more
> Than this example of all womanhood,
> So mild, so merciful, so strong, so pure,
> This were enough to prove it higher and truer
> Than all the creeds the world has known before."

It is a Catholic personage who is made to speak here, but we must remember that the words and the warmth of expression are Longfellow's own. *The Golden Legend* was only one part of a trilogy, which he had in mind and was working out during a period of over thirty years—the most of his poetic career. Late in life he wrote *The Divine Tragedy*, the story of Christ, as the first part, adding *The New England Tragedies*, or the story of religious persecution in New England, as the third part; and published the whole under the title of "Christus: A Mystery." The New England portion, as representing modern Christianity, was a sorry failure poetically, and by narrowing the field to these two episodes of Quaker and witchcraft wrongs, it left out of reckoning

true modern Christianity, which is the Church, now and always the same. But at least in his "Finale," where St. John is supposed to speak, the poet rebuked the falsity of Puritan oppression by returning

> . . . . "unto the single thought
> By the great master taught,
> Not he that repeateth the name,
> But he that doeth the will"

shall be saved. Catholics are not likely to quarrel with this assertion. The trouble about Longfellow, here, is that he takes liberties with St. John, whom he represents as "wandering over the face of the earth," declaring that

> "The clashing of Creeds and the strife
> Of the many beliefs that *in vain*
> Perplex man's heart and brain
> Are naught but the rustle of leaves,
> When the breath of God upheaves
> The boughs of the tree of life,
> And they subside again."

What does he mean? It is chiefly a rhetorical fancy, but if we can decipher from it any clear idea, the implication is apparently that all this vain clashing is perfectly natural, inevitable and harmless, and must go on forever like the helpless surging of branches. This is both vague and untrue. So also is the statement put into St. John's mouth, that

> "From all vain pomps and shows
> And the craft of tongue and pen,
> Bewildered in its search,
> Bewildered with the cry:
> Lo, here! lo, there! the Church!
> Poor sad humanity
> Turns back with bleeding feet
> By the weary road it came."

A large portion of humanity does nothing of the kind, but is quite certain of its footing, and still goes forward, not backward, with the true Church on the road laid out for it by Christ and His Apostles. The first part of "Christus," *The Divine Tragedy*, is also weak, largely because Longfellow here, as in his Salem play, relied only upon himself; and, notwithstanding all his religious aspiration, he never fully believed in the actual divinity of Christ, therefore could not express it. What stands out before all is the fact that in this trilogy the only successful part is *The Golden Legend*, which relies upon Catholic ideas, subject, scenery and a theme taken from a story of the Catholic past, the material and sentiment of which were made and moulded ready to his hand.

Longfellow, too, throughout his life, was a close and almost devout student of Dante, the great Catholic poet of the ages, and became his best literal translator in verse. The sonnets with which he prefaced that translation are filled with an exquisite spirit of piety and reverence. Although he sometimes went curiously astray, as in his Wayside Inn tale of *Torquemada*, and always used Catholic matters mainly as a sort of artistic fancy dress when it suited his poetic purpose, still enough has been quoted here, and may be found in other poems of his, to show that he had a strong apprehension of the inner as well as the outward force and loveliness of Catholicity.

Another eminent New England poet and critic, who explored Dante deeply, was James Russell Lowell. In his massive and brilliant essay on the great Italian, he says that Dante believed that "obedience to God's law was the highest duty of man," also that his "convictions were so intimate that they were not merely intellectual conclusions, but *parts of his moral being*." Now, non-Catholics also hold convictions as to religion, but they very often hold them intellectually and, in a sort, separate from the whole moral being. A Catholic cannot keep the two things apart, unless he be a bad Catholic; in which case he is conscious, at the bottom of his heart, that he is a humbug, and that the punishment he brings upon himself will be long and bitter hereafter. Lowell seems to have perceived the true Catholic union of attributes in Dante. He also remarks: "Dante's want of faith in freedom [alleged] was of the same kind with Milton's refusal to confound license with liberty." Again he tells us of the "Divina Commedia:" "We have heard that the 'Commedia' was a sermon, a political pamphlet, the revengeful satire of a disappointed Ghibelline—nay, worse—of a turncoat Guelph . . . . and yet, singularly enough, the circle of its charm has widened in proportion as men have receded from the theories of Church and State which are supposed to be its foundation, and as the modes of thought of its author have become more alien to those of his readers. [Protestant readers are here referred to.] In spite of all objections, the 'Commedia' remains one of the three or four universal books that have ever been written." And he even says of Dante: "His readers turn students, his students zealots, and what was a taste becomes a religion."

The cult of Dante may have become with Lowell, as with so many others outside the fold, a sort of religion; but Catholicity did not become Lowell's faith. Yet in one of his earlier and best known pieces, *The Vision of Sir Launfal*, he tried his best to tell the story of a Catholic who, in a Catholic time, learned, by long pilgrimage and suffering, the lesson of humility and Christian

brotherhood. He there used Catholic ideas and allusions abundantly, if not with clear knowledge. But an example of his Catholic leaning, still more in point, is the short poem

ALL SAINTS.

"One feast, of holy days the crest,
I, though no churchman, love to keep,
All Saints—the unknown good that rest
In God's still memory folded deep;
The bravely dumb that did their deed,
And scorned to blot it with a name,
Men of the plain heroic breed,
That loved heaven's silence more than fame.
Such lived not in the past alone,
But thread to-day the unheeding street;
And stairs to sin and famine known
Sing with the welcome of their feet.
* * * * * *
About their brows to me appears
An aureole traced in tenderest light,
The rainbow-gleam of smiles and tears
In dying eyes, by them made bright;
Of souls that shivered on the edge
Of that chill ford repassed no more,
And in *their* mercy felt the pledge
And sweetness of the farther shore."

Now, if he celebrates the unknown saints, why not also the known and the canonized? One sees, at least, how close he came to a perception of the Communion of Saints. Lowell's most remarkable poem in this direction, however, is *The Cathedral.* Here he tells us how he visited the Cathedral at Chartres, in France, and records his reflections. They were secular, of course, and in places superficial, but had a strong religious tinge. The sculptured figures on the cathedral porch seemed to say to him:

"Be reverent, ye who flit and are forgot,
Of faith so nobly realized as this."
* * * * * *
"I entered, reverent of whatever shrine
Guards piety and solace for my kind
Or gives the soul a moment's truce of God."

But when he passes within, he asks:

"Was all this grandeur but anachronism?
Is old religion but a spectre now,
Haunting the solitude of darkened minds,
Mocked out of memory by the skeptic day?"

Lowell, like most Protestants, is not aware that great numbers of Catholics have taken Holy Communion at Mass early in the morning, long before he had thought of stirring from bed. Hence

he inclines to muse upon the deserted state of the temple and the sanctuary at the hour of his visit. Suddenly he sees an old woman on her knees, telling, as he puts it, "mechanic beads"; though we know that, however rapidly the beads may be said,—and the original of the word is the Anglo-Saxon "bede," which means "prayer" itself,—they are not mechanical, so long as there is faith in the heart. At first he assumes that the old woman is appealing to some saint as a

> "Bribed intercessor with the far-off Judge."

But then a kindlier thought rebukes him, and he cries out:

> "God is in all that liberates and lifts,
> In all that humbles, sweetens and consoles:
> Blesséd the natures shored on every side
> With landmarks of hereditary thought!
> Thrice happy they that wander not life-long
> Beyond near succor of the household faith,
> The guarded fold that shelters, not confines!"

There could scarcely be a better statement as to the effect of the true faith, which protects but does not confine, and, on the contrary, makes the believer genuinely free under divine law, as opposed to human license.

Immediately, though, Lowell tries to drag himself back from this perception, inquiring:

> "Or was it not mere sympathy of brain?
> A sweetness intellectually conceived
> In simpler creeds, to me impossible?"

But, in the next breath, he admits:

> "Yet for a moment I was snatched away
> And had the evidence of things not seen;
> For one rapt moment;—then it all came back,
> This age that *blots out life with question-marks.*"

Here we have the Protestant mind, in the person of one of its worthiest American poets, drawing close to the beauty of holiness and true faith, suddenly springing away from it again, and yet admitting that it does so because his present age blots out life with question-marks. Life? What life? Evidently, from the context, he means the soul's life. And why should he submit to let it be blotted and obscured with doubts? We have not space here to give one-half the passages we had marked in Lowell's *Cathedral*. But surely these lines must be quoted:

"The Cross, bold type of shame to homage turned,
Of an unfinished life that sways the world,
Shall tower as sovereign emblem over all."

Reflect: this is what Lowell says, whose New England ancestors (like those of some others among us) refused to allow the cross to be shown anywhere as a symbol of Christian faith! Yet all this, by no means, makes Lowell a Catholic Christian. Like Longfellow, though approaching so near in perception, he falls far short of realization. He fails to follow out the train of spiritual thought to its logical result. So, in spite of its really startling gleams of truth, *The Cathedral* remains full of false inference, doubt and discontent; and it ends, like Longfellow's "Christus," with a feeble sophistry; a flight for refuge to the notion that each man, after all, need only deal with God directly by his own light. Says Lowell:

"If sometimes I must hear good men debate
Of other witness of Thyself than Thou,
As if there needed any help of ours
To nurse Thy flickering life, that else must cease,
My soul shall not be taken in their snare."

This is the same fallacy of the Quaker in saying that God has no need of human learning, and of those translators of the Bay Psalm Book, who, in excusing their bad workmanship, begged it to be remembered that "God's altar needs not our pollishings." The existence of God does not depend on our accepting his testimony, but our own state of existence does very much depend on that. Lowell's *Cathedral*, notwithstanding his involuntary self-deceit and intellectual pride, is a remarkable exposition of the thoughtful Protestant mind, as he himself expresses it:

"Buzzing o'er past and future with vain quest;"—

desiring peace and faith's completeness, and yet afraid or incompetent or lacking grace to grasp it.

It may be urged that Longfellow and Lowell were strongly tinged with European culture, and, by their journeys abroad and study of old literature, had become imbued unconsciously with Catholic sympathies. But what shall we say of Nathaniel Hawthorne? One ancestor of this greatest among American prose romancers, William Hathorne, violently persecuted the Quakers. Another, John Hathorne, was even more vengeful toward the accused Salem witches, whom he caused to be put to death. Both were bitter foes of the Church of England, and if a genuine Catholic had fallen into their power, it is hard to imagine what extreme of punishment would have satisfied their animosity against

him. Nathaniel Hawthorne himself grew up under the strictest Puritan influences of Maine and of Salem, Massachusetts. He never saw Europe until he was forty-eight years old; and the book that first gave him great fame, "The Scarlet Letter," was not published until he was forty-six. Up to that time, we must bear in mind, Catholics in New England were few and far between, existing as an almost proscribed body. Yet Hawthorne's "Scarlet Letter" brims over with satire upon the warped, uncharitable religion and practice of his Puritan predecessors. Now let us see what he has to say, incidentally, in that book, bearing on Catholicity.

In one chapter he tells us of the Puritan minister, Arthur Dimmesdale:

"Here the pale clergyman piled up his library, rich with parchment-bound folios of the Fathers, and the lore of Rabbis, and *the monkish erudition, of which the Protestant divines, even while they vilified and decried that class of writers,* were yet constrained often to avail themselves."

Especially notable is the conversation in the tenth chapter between Arthur Dimmesdale, the guilty minister, and Roger Chillingworth, on the subject of confessing sin. Chillingworth, the physician, who is also the wronged husband, asks—if the revelation of sin "at the last day" is going to be a relief, why guilty persons should not seek the solace of confession here in this life?

"They mostly do," answered Dimmesdale. "Many a poor soul has given its confidence to me, not only on the death-bed but while strong in life and fair in reputation. And ever, after such an outpouring, oh, what a relief have I witnessed in those sinful brethren! . . . . Yet some men bury their secrets," he continues.

"Such men deceive themselves," Chillingworth replies. "They fear to take up the shame that rightfully belongs to them. . . . . But, if they seek to glorify God, let them not lift heavenward their unclean hands! If they would save their fellow-men, let them do it by making manifest *the power and reality of conscience, in constraining them to penitential self-abasement!*"

Truly this is a strong utterance, coming from an imaginary Puritan and written by an author of unmixed Puritan descent. The physician, Chillingworth, while urging open confession thus, really desired that Dimmesdale should keep his sin secret, so that Chillingworth himself might go on torturing the poor minister's soul all through the earthly life. The lesson of the book is that open confession was the only road to escape from such torture, the only way to the soul's freedom. When the minister mounts the pillory and proclaims his sin, the vengeful friend, Chillingworth, cries:

"Hadst thou sought the whole earth over, there was no one place so secret where thou couldst have escaped me—save on this very scaffold!"

"Thanks be to Him who hath led me hither!" answered the minister.

So much for open, public confession as advocated in "The Scarlet Letter." In "The Blithedale Romance," written soon afterward, which gave the substance of Hawthorne's experience at the half religious, half socialistic Brook Farm community, he wrote: "As the basis of our institution, we proposed to offer up the earnest toil of our bodies as a prayer for the advancement of our race;" an almost purely Catholic conception. "The Scarlet Letter," his first triumphant romance, instilled the idea of public confession. His last great work, "The Marble Faun," written about ten years later, brought out with great force the absolute necessity of the *secret auricular confessional*. Very curiously, when we consider all the circumstances of Hawthorne's origin and career, this closing romance had its scene in Rome, and was partly written there. A young and marvellously pure New England girl, Hilda, in the story, witnesses a murder; and her mind and heart have hitherto been so stainless that the mere unwilling knowledge of this crime becomes to her a burden greater than she can bear. In reading the following extracts some allowance must be made for traces of the author's lingering prejudice:

"Rome," he says, in the thirty-seventh chapter, entitled "Altars and Incense," "has a certain species of consolation readier at hand, for all the necessitous, than any other spot under the sky, and Hilda's despondent state made her peculiarly liable to the peril, *if peril it can justly be termed*, of seeking or consenting to be thus consoled. Had the Jesuits known the situation of this troubled heart, her inheritance of New England Puritanism would hardly have protected the poor girl from the pious strategy of those good fathers. Knowing, as they do, how to work each proper engine, it would have been ultimately impossible for Hilda to resist the attractions of a faith which so marvellously adapts itself to every human need. Not, indeed, that it can satisfy the soul's cravings, but at least it can sometimes help the soul towards a higher satisfaction than the faith contains within itself. It supplies a multitude of external forms in which the spirit may be clothed and manifested; it has many painted windows, as it were, through which the celestial sunshine, else disregarded, may make itself gloriously perceptible in visions of beauty and splendor. There is no one want or weakness of human nature for which Catholicism will own itself without a remedy. . . . . To do it justice, Catholicism is such a miracle of fitness for its own ends, many of which might seem to be admirable ones, that it is difficult to imagine it a contrivance of mere man. . . . . Hilda had, therefore, made many pilgrimages among the churches of Rome for the sake of wondering at their gorgeousness. . . . . Restless with her trouble, Hilda now entered upon another pilgrimage among these altars and shrines. . . . . She went—and it was a dangerous errand—to observe how closely and comfortably the popish faith applied itself to all human occasions. It was impossible to doubt that multitudes of people found their spiritual advantage in it who would find none at all in our own formless mode of worship; which, besides, so far as sympathy of prayerful souls is concerned, can be enjoyed only at stated and too unfrequent periods. But here, whenever the hunger for divine nutriment came upon the soul it could, on the instant, be appeased. At one or another altar the incense was forever ascending, the Mass always being performed, and carrying upward with it the devotion of such as had not words for their own prayer. And yet, if the worshipper had his individual petition to offer, his own heart secret to whisper below his breath, there were divine auditors ever ready to receive it from his lips; and, what encouraged him still more, these auditors had not always been divine, but kept within their

heavenly memories the tender humility of a human experience. Now a saint in heaven, but once a man on earth. . . . . Often and long Hilda lingered before the shrines and chapels of the Virgin, and departed from them with reluctant steps. . . . . Oftener than to the other churches, she wandered into St. Peter's. Within its vast limits she thought, and beneath the sweep of its great dome there should be room for all the forms of Christian truth; room both for the heretic and the faithful to kneel; due help for every creature's spiritual want. . . . . Must not the faith that built this matchless edifice, and warmed, illuminated, and overflowed it, include whatever can satisfy human aspirations at the loftiest or minister to human necessity at the sorest? If religion had a material home, was it not here?"

Thus far, Hawthorne. The rest may be condensed in few words: Kneeling, by a sudden impulse, before a shrine adorned by a mosaic of St. Michael the Archangel, "she sobbed out a prayer . . . . that the burden of her spirit might be lightened a little." Then, nerved by this supplication, she entered a confessional and, heretic though she was, poured out the dark story which had infused its poison into her innocent life. Although the good Father discovered that she was a heretic, and so debarred from the full privilege of absolution, she experienced a vast relief, and said to him: "In spite of my heresy, you may one day see the poor girl to whom you have done this great Christian kindness coming to remind you of it and thank you for it in the better land."

That which impresses us most in all this is the intense, the intimate sympathy with Catholic faith and practice which Hawthorne developed; beginning by the lesson of repentance and open confession in "The Scarlet Letter," and ending with an illustration of the need of auricular confession according to the Church's forms and precepts. Hilda resisted the suggestion that she should accept the complete Christian faith, because, as she said, she was "a daughter of the Puritans." Other and actual daughters of the Puritans have since entered into the Catholic faith, and, judging by these remarkable passages from the writings of Hawthorne, who was held back by his environment, it is hardly more than reasonable to infer that if he were living to-day he, too, might very likely have become a Catholic.

At any rate, it is clear, even from our brief glance at a few books and men, that the religious element which we have noted as a powerful factor in American literature shines out in these recent authors as vividly as in the earliest, though in a different way. Descendants of the Puritans, they have removed themselves very far from the Puritan position, and have developed an emphatic leaning toward Catholic truth.

We had meant to say something more of Whittier, whom, despite his former fanatical outbursts at one time against Pius IX., we may all delight in for his beautiful pictures, in song, of American life and for the sweet natural religion that is in him. We can do

nothing more, at this writing, than remind our readers that he illustrates this quality; and that in a number of his poems he wrote sympathetically and admiringly of Catholic themes and heroes.

Another great American, Ralph Waldo Emerson, sprung from a line of Congregational ministers, dropped into Unitarianism first and from this emerged as a Transcendentalist tinged with pantheism. Some of us owe him a great debt for his luminous, though detached, flashes of insight in merely human wisdom, his mental serenity, his original and exquisite but erratic poems. As a leader in philosophy or toward true religion, however, he is useless, being in these respects utterly devoid of ground principles or coherent thought. We do not wish to cast the least reproach upon the beauties of his mind. But it is pertinent to observe that while in him we have a grandson of the Puritans, who had deserted them as completely as Longfellow, Lowell, or Hawthorne did, Emerson carefully screened his eyes from Catholic truth. In the midst of the most exalted and spiritualized utterances of his "transcendent" thinking, therefore, we find him saying things so flat, so absolutely wanting in reverence or perception, that we are reminded of the legendary Greek whose wings of wax—just as he seemed about to fly upward to the sun—melted, and let him fall to the earth in ruin. For instance, Emerson has so completely lost the perception of sacred mystery that, in renouncing his Unitarian ministry, which still required some vague sort of belief in the Holy Eucharist, he says: "To eat bread and drink wine is one thing; to follow the precepts of Christ is another and a different thing."

Now it is very singular that two men among the strongest exponents of Catholicity in the United States, were converts, who before their reception into the Church had shared in this same Transcendental movement of which Emerson was an inspirer. These two men were Dr. Orestes A. Brownson and Father Hecker, the founder of the Paulists. Brownson, a prodigious student, a man absolutely sincere, who had explored all the sects and been part of some among them, but happily came to the wholeness of Catholic Christianity and, once arrived there, defended it with leonine force to the end of his life, was the greatest philosophic mind American literature has ever produced among the laity. He was the Daniel Webster among lay defenders of the faith. In the twenty massive volumes of his complete works he covered, or touched with a mighty hand, nearly every topic of vital interest that stirred the hearts and the minds of Americans, during his lifetime. He had lived and felt and clearly thought his way through all the misleading dreams, the doubts, the conceits and the illusions of omniscience which to the last kept Emerson spell-bound.

To Brownson, God and the soul were as real as any other object that he could perceive, with the faculties of perception born in man. From the broad view-point thus gained, in the bright illumination shed around him, he wrote comprehensively of democracy, of the Republic, of the Church, of the faith, and of literature. If one wishes to see how Emerson's philosophy disappears in the light of a greater star that shines only for the glory of God, one should consult Brownson's review of Emerson's poems, in the nineteenth volume of his works.

Of Father Hecker, the other convert just alluded to, we have a worthy record in Father Elliott's life of him; detailing a wonderful and devoted career, which was followed out plainly and simply in these present United States of ours. Brownson was a poor, adopted child who, early separated from his parents, educated himself and rose to be one of the foremost American lay advocates of Catholicity, in his generation. Father Hecker was a humble baker's apprentice of German origin, who—by a divine calling which, for years, he was unable to explain even to himself, and still less to his Methodist mother—came at last to be the founder of a new religious order, the Paulists, whose origin belongs to the United States and reflects credit on the Republic; and his "Questions of Nature" and "Aspirations of the Soul" form an interesting literary link between Transcendentalism and Catholicity.

Neither of these men can one find fairly represented, or, sometimes, even mentioned, in the current histories and handbooks of American literature. Why? Because they were Catholics! But, even if they be not in the handbooks, they still hold a high and permanent place in the literature and the life of the American people. Hecker lived at Brook Farm, as Hawthorne did. Brownson partly sympathized with Brook Farm for awhile, as Emerson did. Hawthorne gradually drew very near to full perception and acceptance of Catholicity. Emerson went farther and farther away from it, and was lost in the mist. Hecker and Brownson who had gone all through this same wandering movement, came out as American Catholics whose names and works will long be revered.

When we reflect upon all this, and upon the earliest days of our literature, does it not come upon the mind irresistibly that the old religious impulse, which was at the roots of the nation, grows up and flowers and dominates all, to-day, in spite of the materialism around us? The Catholic idea is not separate from the nation, and never was. It was here at the seed-time: it is here now. Hecker, Brownson and Hawthorne were all among the New England Transcendentalists, who—as Father Elliott tells us—"had indeed cut the root, but the sap of Christian principle still lingered in the trunk and branches and brought forth fruit which was super-

natural, though destined never to ripen." In Hecker and Brownson it did ripen gloriously; and in Hawthorne it came near doing so.

Cardinal Newman says: "There is a large floating body of Catholic truth in the world. . . . . It comes down by tradition from age to age. . . . . Men [outside the Church] take up and profess these scattered truths, merely because they fall in with them." Brownson and Father Hecker received the whole truth; not the fragments. Viewing them as a direct outcome of American life and thought in various lines, we may fairly conclude that they represent the influence which guides the needle and, amid all its oscillations and declinations, draws it back toward the pole-star.

A word should be added, in this place, to call attention, albeit inadequately, to the presence in our literature of to-day of popular authors like Marion Crawford, John Boyle O'Reilly, Brother Azarias, Louise Imogen Guiney, Agnes Repplier and Katherine E. Conway—Catholic novelists, poets or essayists, all of them—who are but part of a growing phalanx that emphasizes, and will by and by emphasize still more the recurrence of Catholic inspiration in American letters; or, rather its abiding existence and indestructibility.

Returning now for a moment to the fact of the needle's variation, mentioned at the beginning of this paper, it is interesting to observe that Columbus, the discoverer of America, was also the man who discovered the one place on the globe where there is *no variation of the magnetic needle from the straight line to the north.* That place is two and a half degrees east of the Island of Corvo, in the Azores. Here in the United States our literature has been swinging and swaying from one point to another; yet, as we see, it has in some notable instances, within the last three hundred years, pointed first or last very closely in one religious direction; and more than ever, now, toward Catholic truth. May there not be a line of no variation that we shall yet reach? Another curious fact. The movement of the compass-needle occupies about three hundred and twenty years. Every great heresy from the Catholic Church, so far, has completed its swing and lost its greatest force in about that length of time. The Protestant division, with all its hundred and fifty subdivisions now existing in the United States, has been swinging here for something less than three hundred years. Perhaps we shall finally discover that the compass-needle of our American literature, after all, is controlled by a mastering tendency toward the pole-star of Catholic faith.

George Parsons Lathrop.

MADAGASCAR AND CATHOLIC MISSIONS.

FEW people in America are acquainted with the remarkable changes that have taken place within our own time in the great African island which for ages was only known to the world as the stronghold of foreign pirates and native barbarians. While the Portuguese, the Hollanders, the English and the French have established their colonies all around the other coasts of the Indian Ocean, Madagascar alone among its islands has retained its independence and defied the efforts at conquest of Europeans. Its native population, long divided into a number of warlike and independent tribes as barbarous as the New Zealanders of the last century, has in our own days been formed into a single well organized state by the energy and conquests of the remotest of these tribes. The Hova tribe, originally settled in a district in the interior of Madagascar not exceeding the size of Massachusetts, has during the present century extended its rule over nearly the whole island, and founded an empire as extensive as Germany or France. The Hova conquest of Madagascar recalls the growth of the Ottoman Empire from a band of warrior shepherds to the greatest power of the world. The efforts of its native rulers to introduce European civilization into their country without sacrificing its independence are paralleled by the action of Peter the Great, of Russia, among his half barbarous subjects. Under both these aspects Madagascar and its people are well worthy of the historian's notice.

Though commonly spoken of as belonging to Africa, Madagascar is in reality as distinct from that continent as Australia is from Asia. The Mozambique Channel which separates Madagascar from the African mainland is not, indeed, over three hundred miles wide, but its depth is enormous, and geologists unite in asserting that there never has been any land connection across it. The native animals show no connection with the African fauna. The lions and great carnivora of Africa are wholly absent in Madagascar, as are the monkeys, the antelopes, the zebras, giraffes and other characteristic African animals which abound on the western shore of the Mozambique Channel. The chief native beast of prey in the Madagascar forests is the foosa, an animal scarcely larger than a domestic cat, but belonging to a distinct family of carnivora which has no representative elsewhere. The lemurs, or half apes, and other small animals belonging to the same zoological family

as the ant eaters of South America, are the principal native occupants of the Madagascar forests. In the eye of a naturalist it is a region almost as completely isolated from any other as is Australia, and this fact tends strongly to show that it never has had any connection with the African Continent.

Soundings of the Indian Ocean, indeed, seem to indicate that, in the distant past, Madagascar extended far to the east towards Ceylon, and some geologists consider that it is but the remnant of a mighty Continent, the bulk of which is now buried beneath the ocean like the lost island of Atlantis. Be this as it may, Madagascar is essentially a land apart from others, and it is not undeserving of the name of Island Continent, sometimes given it by its inhabitants.

In extent Madagascar equals several of the most important countries of Europe. It is as large as France or Germany, and except Borneo and Greenland, is the largest island in the world, properly so-called. It stretches nearly a thousand miles from north to south while its width is little over three hundred anywhere. In natural capabilities and conditions it somewhat resembles Cuba, but it has four times the area of the Pearl of the Antilles. Like it, it is traversed by great mountain ranges running through its whole length and forming the elevated plateau of Imerina in the centre of the island. This plateau, surrounded by granitic mountain peaks, and nearly seven thousand square miles in extent, has some resemblance to the valley in which the City of Mexico is built. Its altitude of four to five thousand feet above the sea level gives it a temperate climate under the tropical sky, and it is thickly peopled and well cultivated. It is the native home of the Hova tribe, which of late years has extended its dominion over most of the island, as the Aztecs, before Cortez, had conquered their neighbors from the Carribbean Sea to the Pacific Ocean. The slopes of the mountains are covered with primitive forests forming a belt at least forty miles wide all around the island and only traversed by trails or bridle-paths. Road-making, though generally recognized as the most efficient material agent of civilization, is much discouraged by the native rulers on political grounds, and journeys in Madagascar have to be made in palanquins (or filajanas, as the native term is), on the shoulders of porters. A similar jealousy of foreign immigration has kept the gold fields which are known to exist in the country from being worked to any great extent.

The population of Madagascar is not more African than its geological history. Its numerous tribes all belong to the Polynesian or Maori race, which has peopled all the islands of the Eastern Archipelago and of the Pacific Ocean north of New Guinea and

Fiji. Their language is closely allied to that of Hawaii and the New Zealand Maoris, and with local peculiarities it is one throughout the whole country. As in many of the Polynesian groups, the color of the Malagasy (the national term for the people) varies considerably from black to that of Southern Europeans. The Hovas of the interior are often of the same complexion as Spaniards, or Italians, while among the coast tribes the color is as dark as that of the natives of India. In no case, however, are the well-known features of the negro race predominant. Negro slaves have been brought from Africa in considerable numbers at various times; but they do not seem to have modified the national type of the Malagasy much. Whether the first Malagasy settlers found a darker race established in the country with which they have amalgamated, as has happened in some of the Pacific groups, is an open question, but at present the whole population forms but one people in race though divided into different tribes, as the Hovas, the Sakalaves, the Betsileos, the Betsimarakas and others. The mental capacity and social organization of the Malagasy race is much above that of the Negroes of Africa, and is similar to that of the Malays of the islands between Asia and Australia. In personal energy and courage they are as much superior to Southern Asiatics as they are to the Negroes in material civilization. The Malay rovers of the Eastern Seas played for centuries a part like that of the Norse Vikings in Western Europe, between the eighth and eleventh centuries. Though no nation of the Malay or Polynesian race has ever founded a great empire, none has ever submitted to slavery, and at the present day they hold almost undisputed possession from Madagascar to Hawaii and from Easter Island to the China Sea.

Though Madagascar lies in the direct track followed for centuries from Europe to India, its relations with the Western World have been very slight until recently. The Portuguese, while they controlled the coasts of India and Eastern Africa in the sixteenth century, only named a few points along its coasts. The French in the following century established several stations for trade in Madagascar and claimed a dominion over the island in accordance with the elastic code of international law in vogue, which made the territories of uncivilized races the prize of the first comer. In the reign of Louis XIV. several factories, including the present town of Tamatave,were established by the French, and the whole island, though unexplored, was claimed as a French possession, and generally regarded as such by the other powers of Europe. During the eighteenth century those stations were neglected by the government, though the governor of the Island of Bourbon bore the title of Governor of Madagascar. The wars of the French Revo-

lution stripped France of all her colonies. The islands of Bourbon and Mauritius were captured by the English fleets, and at the Peace of Vienna England retained the latter while restoring the other captured colonies of France. Shortly afterwards, however, the English Governor of Mauritius claimed that the old French posts in Madagascar were a part of his jurisdiction, and sent an expedition to secure a footing in the island. Diplomatic negotiations were at once opened by the French Government, and finally, in 1816, the British Ministry was obliged, by the terms of the treaty, to renounce openly all pretensions over Madagascar.

Though thus baffled, apparently, Governor Farquhar, with the characteristic greed of territorial acquisition which has always marked the policy of England, continued his attempts to secure a foothold in Madagascar. A new power had arisen in the island during the latter part of the eighteenth century. The relations of the French with the natives had been confined to the coast tribes, known as Sakalaves and Betisimarakas. A tribe, the Hovas, long established in the central plateau of the island, and hitherto unacquainted with the French or any other Europeans, rose to power in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and had extended its dominion to a part of the coast at the time when Bourbon and Mauritius were occupied by the English forces. The Hova kingdom was founded by a warlike chief, bearing the formidable name of Andrianama Poinimerina, and became a conquering power under his rule and that of his successors, though on a limited scale. One of these, an enterprising and ambitious young man, known as Radama I., mounted the Hova throne in 1810, at the age of eighteen, at the time when the English navy was paramount in the Indian Ocean. Radama was keenly desirous of extending his empire over the whole island, and for that end he was anxious to obtain the help of European arms and military training. Governor Farquhar found in this disposition of the Hova king a favorable opportunity for getting a foothold in Madagascar for English influence. He sent agents to Tamatave, offering to supply the Hovas with the much-desired arms; and scarcely had the British government recognized the jurisdiction of France over the island than the governor of Mauritius made a treaty with Radama acknowledging him as supreme monarch of Madagascar, and furnishing him with arms and military instructors to enable him to conquer his independent neighbors. To give a philanthropic color to this peculiar transaction, it was stipulated that Radama should prohibit his subjects from engaging in the slave trade by sea. The abolition of the slave trade by the British navy had become a popular policy in England since the trade in question had ceased to be profitable to British merchants. It admira-

bly combined philanthropy and profit. It gave British cruisers an opportunity of practising in African and Asiatic waters the right of search, which the war with this country had ended elsewhere in 1814. At the same time, it gave a plausible pretext for seizing on coveted territory in the name of humanity. The treaty between Governor Farquhar and Radama, in 1818, which was duly ratified later by the home government, is a good instance of the practical workings of British philanthropy in politics. The slave trade by sea from Madagascar was limited in extent, as the natives owned little shipping. Moreover, as the Hovas had at the time a very limited coast territory, the trade in question was practically not under their control. The abolition of the slave export, however, formed a colorable pretext in Europe for acknowledging the Hova chief as king of Madagascar, and securing a foothold in the island by his alliance. In consideration of this end, Radama was furnished with the means of inaugurating slave raids throughout the island on an unprecedented scale, and in establishing a kind of Turkish despotism over the hitherto independent population of Madagascar. It is significant of the true value of the philanthropic side of the treaty that, two years later, the slave trade by sea was openly restored by Farquhar's successor as British governor. The object of securing British influence in Madagascar had been secured, and the British governor saw no need of further keeping up the pretext on which it was first obtained.

The military superiority which English arms and officers had given to the Hovas, made Radama desirous of introducing European civilization further among his subjects. The Malagasy were illiterate, like most Polynesian tribes, and their language had never been reduced to writing. The king determined to end this state of affairs by founding schools in his capital. His English visitors recommended the employment of Protestant missionaries as teachers, and the London Missionary Society, in 1820, sent out several, who were well received in Tananarivo. Radama and his people had no definite system of religion like Mohammedanism or Brahminism. Their ideas of God and the future life were vague, and though some idolatrous rites were practised, there were neither temples nor a priesthood in Madagascar. A belief in witchcraft was the strongest superstition among the Malagasy, and the barbarous ordeal of the tanguen was their most important rite of a religious character. The tanguen, so named from a plant of the species of nux vomica which was used in its practices, consisted in obliging accused persons to clear themselves of the charges brought against them by swallowing a poisoned draught. If they were able to vomit the poison they were held innocent, but if not, death was the penalty. The executions for this cause among the

Hovas were on a scale of enormous magnitude. Whole villages were often obliged to submit to the ordeal at the whim of a Hova governor, and thousands were sometimes butchered in consequence. The punishments were also excessively barbarous. Death was inflicted in various forms. One punishment consisted in scalding by boiling water; another was burying alive; and a third was hurling from a precipice near the capital. Radama, though merciless in his conquests, felt a natural repugnance to the barbarities of the tanguen code, and forbade its practice, when fully established in his kingdom. He thus set himself, to some extent, against the native superstitions, and on this account he the more readily accepted the Protestant missionary teachers on simple motives of state policy.

The English missionaries, on their side, showed little desire to teach any distinctive form of Christianity. They chiefly occupied themselves in founding schools to teach reading and writing, and when these were acquired the Bible as a class-book was supposed to convey all the Christianity needed. Radama and his nobles, in fact, regarded Christianity as synonymous with the power of reading books, and, at a late period his successor declared the profession of the first and the possession of printed books equally unlawful. Radama himself, however, cordially favored the establishment of the mission schools, and numbers of the nobles sent their children to them. It is estimated by the Protestant missionaries that over ten thousand natives learned to read in the fifteen years that the schools continued. The name of Christian was commonly given by the natives to these pupils, though few professed any definite Christian belief. The influence and power of England, however, was strongly impressed on the minds of the young Malagasy pupils by the missionaries, and their efforts in this direction afterwards produced striking results.

On the death of Radama I., in 1828, a reaction set in against the foreign customs introduced by him. His widow, Ranavalona, succeeded him. She was a woman of remarkable energy and intelligence, and she had a profound distrust of European interference in Madagascar. The tanguen ordeal was again made law by the royal authority, and Christianity in any form was proscribed.

The English ministers were expelled in 1835, and a policy of non-intercourse with strangers adopted by the queen. She was in her own way both an energetic and a politic ruler, and during her reign of thirty-three years she materially extended and consolidated the power of her dynasty throughout Madagascar. Her authority was enforced by barbarous punishments. On one occasion no less than five thousand persons were forced to pass the ordeal of the tanguen, and thousands of families were exterminated

or reduced to slavery on mere suspicion of disloyalty. Nevertheless, Ranavalona retained her sway undisputed and even with the respect of her people until her death in 1861. To the end of her reign Christianity in any form was as rigorously proscribed in Madagascar as in the old Roman empire in its persecuting days.

Catholic zeal did not wait for royal invitations to attempt the conversion of Madagascar. That task indeed had been attempted more than two centuries before, and amongst its promoters was no less a person than St. Vincent de Paul. A bishopric had been established in Madagascar in the seventeenth century, and though the missions had been destroyed by the wars of the natives, the hope of the restoration was never abandoned. In 1844 a French priest, M. Dalmont, undertook the task, and was named Pro-vicar Apostolic of Madagascar by the Holy See.

The Hova dominions were closed against Catholic missionaries as well as other Europeans, but the Sakalaves of the coast were still independent, and among them Father Dalmond founded his first mission in 1845. The early years of work were beset with countless trials; mission after mission was ruined by the wars of the native chiefs, and the deadly fevers of the coast cut off the missionaries at an unexampled rate. Father Dalmond died in four years after his arrival, and his successor, Mgr. Monnet, was carried to the grave a few hours after landing in his mission. The Holy See at the urgent advice of Father Dalmont decided on placing the Madagascar Mission in the hands of a religious order. The General of the Jesuits accepted the charge, and the French province of that order undertook to carry on the mission in 1848, and has done so ever since.

The French Jesuits set to work with all the zeal and system which are the common qualities of Jesuit missions. Besides establishing churches and schools at suitable points along the coast, they founded a large industrial school in the island of Reunion or Bourbon, to which promising pupils were sent to learn trades and the ways of civilized life which they might afterwards bring back to Madagascar. A normal school for training native school teachers and a seminary for native students for the priesthood was also established in Reunion. The Sakalave tribes were in such a disturbed state from wars among themselves and incursions of the Hovas that the work of conversion was very slow for years. Churches and schools were scarcely founded when destroyed again, and only three establishments were able to enjoy a permanent existence at St. Mary's, Nossi Be and Mayotte. Such was the state of the Madagascar Mission sixteen years after its foundation. The results appeared small for the labor expended by the missionaries, but such has been the common lot of the Church on her first entry to most of the lands where she now holds sway.

An important change in the political conditions of the island occurred in 1861. Ranavalona, the great Hova queen, died in that year at the age of eighty, and her son Radama II. signalized his accession by abolishing the laws against Christianity and opening communications with the nations of Europe. Embassies were received from both France and England, and the London Missionary Society was invited to resume the work it had carried on under the first Radama. All the old establishments of the Protestant Mission were restored to the new comers by the government, and the English ministers at once found themselves in high influence at the Hova capital. Father Webber, the Superior of the Jesuit Mission, at once took advantage of the new order of things and went to Tananarivo where Radama II. received him well and granted a site for a Catholic church and school. The Hova population, more civilized than the coast tribes, showed a marked tendency towards the reception of Catholicity. A congregation of native converts was formed in a few months and continued to grow rapidly. The king and queen, though pagans, showed a strong inclination towards the Church, and Radama addressed a respectful letter to the Holy Father on his accession.

The most serious opposition to the progress of conversion came not from the people but from the English Protestants and their partisans. The English Protestant schools in the Hova capital had been closed since 1835, but during their existence a number of pupils had been educated in them, and many of those belonged to the dominant aristocracy of chiefs. Under the despotic rule of Ranavalona the profession of Christianity was strictly forbidden, but a certain bond of sympathy continued to unite the former pupils of the English schools. On the accession of Radama II. and his revival of his father's policy, these men, both by rank and conformity with the king's ideas, obtained a very large share of power in the government. The court felt the need of European instruction to carry out its projected work of civilization which it had taken up, but it wavered between the influence of French or English guides. The French protectorate over the coasts of Madagascar was an obstacle to the extension of the Hova rule over the whole island which was a ruling principle of their policy. On the other hand, France had never made any serious attempt at conquest or colonization in Madagascar, and it seemed quite possible to secure the objects of the native policy by friendly treaty with France. Regarding the question with a view to the natural and just wish of the Malagasy to retain their independence and possession of their country, a French alliance appears to an unprejudiced observer to be the best for native interests. Though neither England nor France has displayed much regard for interna-

tional rights in their dealings with less civilized races, it is undeniable that the lot of the latter under French influences has always been better then when brought into contact with English policy. The differences in the fate of the American Indians in Canada and in the former English colonies is a striking example. The result to the Maoris of New Zealand of English intercourse under missionary auspices is another, when compared to the conditions of a similar race in Tahiti or Mangareva. It could not be expected however that the Hova king or his advisers should be acquainted with the general facts of modern history, and so the idea of securing the empire of the island by English aid was readily accepted from the new English missionaries by a large body of the chiefs. The Protestant Mission became a centre of English political influence in Tananarivo, and its members used this influence to attack the Catholic Church in its beginnings. The Catholics were described as idolators and their priests as French political agents, while at the same time their poverty was contrasted in the usual tone of Protestant religious argument with the abundant resources of the English missionaries. The peculiarly English system of religion which makes the sovereign supreme head of the Church, was also, it was urged, exactly the thing suited for Madagascar in a political sense. The argument was a strong one to a dominant class which chiefly sought in Christianity the benefits of material civilization without any loss of its own dominion, and it had great weight among the Hova nobles.

Radama II. and his queen were personally favorable to the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and sent their nephews and niece to be trained in the Catholic schools. Though absolute monarch in theory, Radama was unable to retain the power which his able mother had so long exercised. A conspiracy was set on foot against him after a few months, the motives of which are veiled in much obscurity, but of which the result was the murder of the king by a band of armed men.

It is not easy for a foreigner to trace the internal policy of the Hova monarchy, which is shrouded in much mystery. The death of Radama seems to have resulted in giving the aristocracy more power and making the sovereign practically a mere figure-head in the government. Radama's wife, Rasoerina, was proclaimed queen, but the practical government of the country was vested in the commander of the army, who was made prime minister. This peculiar arrangement, by which a mayor of the palace is virtually sovereign, has been ever since retained in Madagascar.

The tragic death of the king did not change materially the policy of the Hovas in regard to European intercourse. Rasoerina and her minister showed themselves equally favorable to the

Catholics and to the English Protestants. But her reign was a short one; for she died in 1868, having received baptism from a Catholic friend in her last illness. Her sister succeeded to the throne under the title of Ranavalona II. The new queen decided to adopt Christianity as the state religion on grounds of a purely political nature. The old pagan rites were abolished, and the king, queen, and prime minister were privately baptized in the palace by a native Protestant preacher, but no definite creed was adopted beyond the name of Christianity. That was all the Hova progressive party desired, and freedom of selecting any form of Christianity was proclaimed for all the queen's subjects. Madagascar, however, had henceforth a state religion which, if it had no other dogma, had at least the distinctive features of being not the creed of the Catholic Church.

The nominal acceptance of Christianity as a matter of policy by a race indifferent to its doctrines or practices is not an unprecedented occurrence. The Dutch Calvinists enrolled some hundred thousands of their subjects in Ceylon as Protestant Christians during their dominion in that island, but the nominal Christianity disappeared with the last Dutch governor. The Taeping chiefs in the last great rebellion in China also once proclaimed themselves followers of Christianity, but no subsequent traces of its existence among them have since been discovered. During the last year, General Booth, of Salvation Army reputation, also enrolled a number of Natal Zulus as Christians on their consent to accept the name and profess their willingness to be saved. The general graciously permitted his converts to continue their old practice of polygamy as a mere detail quite immaterial to Christian morals. The Christianity established as the state religion by the Hova court was of an equally accommodating kind. Attendance at church on Sundays and calling themselves Christians are the only requirements of Malagasy Protestant Christianity. To secure the former, it is the regular custom for the Hova governors of districts to act themselves as preachers, and in the court chapel the English missionaries are not allowed to officiate except by special invitation. Vague, however, as are the doctrines of the Hova state church, its importance as a political engine of government is very considerable, and its establishment has been a serious impediment to the general acceptance of Catholicity by the natives.

It is true that Ranavalona II., when establishing the new state church, publicly announced that all her subjects were free to choose their religion at will. The freedom of religion thus announced was, however, in practice moulded on the lines of toleration granted by England to Catholics at the close of the last cen-

tury. All government offices were reserved for the professors of the queen's religion, as well as all preferments in the army. The population at large was compelled to erect Protestant churches and schools wherever ordered by the ministers, while even the liberty of purchasing sites for Catholic churches could only be obtained with the greatest difficulty and after long delays. The officials frequently commanded the population in various districts to attend the Protestant churches, and though refusal to do so was not a crime by the law, it exposed the recusants to very serious consequences. The Hova government is as absolute as the Turkish, and it claims the right of forced service on the public works from its subjects at the queen's discretion. If a native should incur the ill-will of a governor, he is liable to be ordered off to work without pay in a distant province for many months. Two laws which have since been enacted go still further in abridging the liberty of conscience promised by the queen. The law of compulsory military service obliges every native Hova to spend a couple of years in the army; but the pupils of Protestant schools, as well as Protestant preachers and teachers, are specially exempted from this duty. Another law requires the attendance of all children of a certain age at school. The parents may send their children to a Catholic school if such exists in their neighborhood, but otherwise they must send them to the Protestant schools, in which hostility to the Catholic Church is taught carefully if no other dogma is. Moreover, it is forbidden to remove any pupil from the Protestant schools if once entered in them. Practically, this law is much the same as that of Russia, which, while nominally granting freedom of conscience, prohibits, under the severest penalties, any member of the state church from changing his form of religion. It is not hard to comprehend how such laws must tend to prevent a half-civilized pagan race from accepting Catholicity. In spite of these obstacles, however, the Jesuits of Madagascar, within twenty years from their arrival in Tananarivo, had formed a Catholic population of no less than eighty thousand, and established schools in which twenty thousand pupils were receiving an education in 1882.

This result is the more remarkable as the Catholic missioners had to contend not only with the ill-will of the Hova government and its English advisers, but also with the direct hostility of the rulers of France, from whom one might have supposed they would naturally look for protection as French citizens in a foreign land. At the moment when the French Jesuits were forming a Catholic population in Madagascar, at the cost of the greatest personal sacrifices, the order to which they belonged was expelled from France by a majority in the Republican Legislature. The natural effect of this tyranny was to cut off the supply of priests imperatively

needed by the growing mission, and at the same time to put the French priests in Madagascar at the mercy of their English opponents. The intolerance of the anti-Catholic politicians in France went further, and in 1881 the industrial schools and seminary in Reunion, which had been for twenty years the great means of spreading Catholicity and civilization among the Malagasy, were suppressed by the government at the demand of the Radical representative of Reunion in the French Corps Legislatif. The apparent motive of this high-handed act of oppression was to ruin the Catholic missions. In a political point of view, it was the severest blow that could be dealt not only to the religious welfare of the natives but also to French influence in the island. The Catholic priests had kept themselves strictly aloof from politics, but their personal character and their zeal for the welfare of the natives had won them the highest respect among all classes of the Malagasy population, as any unprejudiced resident can testify. The personal character and work of the French Jesuits had done more than any other agency to raise the national character of France in the eyes of the natives, and yet they were publicly branded as outlaws by their own government without a trial. To an American it looks as if reckless antipathy to the Catholic Church, and more especially to the Order of St. Ignatius and St. Francis Xavier, were a stronger motive of action with the dominant politicians in France than regard for the national interests of their country. As far as lay in their power, they handed over the Hovas to the control of the English missionaries by their anti-Jesuit legislation. That the mission has survived their hostility is an undoubted fact, but its survival must be attributed to a power outside of and above the men who controlled the politics of the French Republic.

The expulsion of the Jesuits from France and its colony was the signal for increased hostility on the part of the Hova government towards the Catholics in its dominions and also for a marked growth of the influence of the English missionaries with the court. A police force was organized from discharged soldiers, and part of its duties was the enforcement of attendance at the Protestant schools and even churches. The French instructors who had been employed in the Hova army were discharged and replaced by English officers. Obstacles were multiplied to the opening of Catholic schools and churches, and the French priests were subjected to numerous vexations by the officials. By a singular course of events, however, this double attack on the Catholic Church brought on a quarrel between the two assailants. The Hovas interpreted the attack of the French government on the Jesuits as a sign of their fear of offending the power of England, to which it

had lately abandoned control of Egypt. Encouraged, it is said, by the advice of some members of the English mission, the queen sent messages to some of the Sakalave chiefs, who were under French protection, ordering them to submit to her own authority. Two complied; and this contempt of French claims roused the national feelings of the French government. There were other causes of dispute already existing, one being the repudiation of the treaty made in 1868, which guaranteed Frenchmen the right to acquire land in the Hova dominions; and another, the claims of the heirs of a Frenchman whose property in the island had been sequestrated by the queen. The Hovas had grown contemptuous of French power, and refused any satisfaction. In consequence, war was declared, in 1883, by France. The government of Ranavalona thereon expelled the Catholic missioners in a body from its territory. For two years the Catholic population was left without priests or Church government. Under those circumstances, the courage of the newly-converted natives was most remarkable. The great majority continued to assemble in their churches at the usual time of public worship. And they were not to be driven from the practice even by threats of massacre, which were frequently made during the continuance of hostilities. One lady of high rank, the widow of the prime minister's son, particularly distinguished herself. She had been a constant attendant at cathedral both before and during the expulsion of the Jesuit missionaries; and on one occasion, when it was announced that cannon had been trained on its doors, she took her place in the centre of the building, opposite the front door, where the first discharge of artillery was expected to take effect. The alarm proved a false one, and the government did not push its hostility further, but the occurrence gave a striking proof of the spirit which animates the recently converted Catholics of Tananarivo.

The war between the Hova kingdom and the French republic lasted nearly three years, without any very extensive hostile operations on either side. The Hova government tried unsuccessfully to effect an alliance with England or Germany, and the French occupied the ports of Tamatave and Majunga. The Queen Ranavalona II. died in 1884, and a relative of hers was chosen to fill the throne under the same name, and married the husband of her predecessor, who continued to rule as prime minister. A peace with France was finally arranged in 1885. By its terms the control of the foreign relations of Madagascar was conceded to France, and an indemnity of two million dollars promised for damages sustained by French citizens and others during the war. Frenchmen were guaranteed full freedom to reside in the country, and the same was secured for the professors of the Catholic religion,

whether French or natives. Thus, by the irresistible force of events, the rulers of France found themselves compelled to demand from a foreign and half-civilized nation that very liberty of teaching and preaching for the Jesuits which they denied them in their own land.

The protectorate over Madagascar, as far as other nations are concerned, thus conceded to France, has been explicitly recognized by Lord Salisbury's government in 1890. The consideration given to England was the recognition of her suzerainty over the island of Zanzibar, which she had previously seized on. Of the moral character of the Anglo-French convention, by which either party renounced the right to the territory which did not belong to either, it is unnecessary to say anything here. The withdrawal of England from any pretence to meddle in the affairs of the Hova kingdom is at least a distinct gain to the well-being of Madagascar, both in a political and a religious point of view.

In point of religion, Madagascar is to-day in a state of transition. The greater part of its territory has been brought by conquest under a single central government, but the authority of that government, outside the dominant race, is entirely dependent on force. The other tribes of the island, numbering three-fourths of its population, retain their native rulers and customs under the control of Hova garrisons, but are no way amalgamated into a single nation with their conquerors. The dominant aristocracy of the Hova monarchy has adopted a nominal Christianity as its state religion, and its policy is to make it general among the people by a compulsory school-law and the monopoly of government patronage in the hands of professors of the queen's religion. This system, more or less modified, has now been in practice for twenty-five years, and has been supported by large contributions of English funds in the hands of the various Protestant missions. Last year the official census gave the attendance at the state schools as one hundred and twenty thousand, but, nevertheless, the people at large show no inclination to adopt a Protestant form of Christianity as their belief. The whole number of Protestant church members was only returned at one hundred and twenty thousand among a population of from five to six millions. The official returns class about two hundred and fifty thousand more as nominal adherents of the different Protestant churches, and what that means in a country where the power of the chiefs is practically unlimited, and attendance at prayers enforced by the police, may easily be judged.

The Catholic missionaries during the same time, despite the opposition of the government and the nobles, and with no resources but the alms of the Propagation of the Faith and their own zeal,

have founded four hundred congregations and brought a population of one hundred and twelve thousand persons to the Catholic faith. The whole staff of the mission consists of one bishop and forty-eight priests, with nineteen Christian Brothers and twenty-seven Sisters of St. Joseph de Clugny to superintend the work of education. Their whole revenue is derived from foreign charity, and does not exceed forty thousand dollars annually,—less than that of many parishes in New York or other American cities,—yet with that they have founded and maintain five hundred and forty schools, conducted by native teachers, and giving schooling to fifteen thousand pupils. We may add to the schools a college, a hospital for lepers, where one hundred and fifty unfortunates are supported and treated, four free dispensaries, an observatory, and a Catholic publishing house as other works of the Jesuits in Madagascar. That the Catholics formed by them are no mere lip servers, their conduct during the two years of the Franco-Malagasy war, when they were left entirely without priests, is the best proof. What will be the religious future of Madagascar, it would be premature to assert absolutely ; but it looks very much as if, at no distant date, it is destined to become a Catholic nation when the present state religion has run the normal course of other similar attempts to mould the revelation of God to the political ends of man.

Bryan J. Clinch.

MORE LIGHT ON THE ELECTION OF URBAN VI.

DR. LOUGHLIN'S able paper on the Great Schism of the West, published in the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW some time ago, has directed the attention of many of its readers to that unfortunate struggle. The Great Schism is one of the most pregnant events in the history of the Church. Its origin, especially, is of more than purely historical importance. Accordingly, Gayet's work on the Great Schism of the West, which furnished much of the material in Dr. Loughlin's article, led to further research by distinguished Catholic scholars in Europe. Prominent among these investigators was Prof. Ludwig Pastor, the distinguished historian of the Popes. His labors were not in vain. Every page of the new revised edition of his "History of the Popes" that deals with the election of Urban VI., bears witness to his industry and success. Not only do we meet with constant references to Gayet, Fincke and other authorities, but he has brought to light several new documents of unusual importance. With these, it is our intention to make our readers acquainted.

The most important piece of new evidence produced by Pastor is a letter of Cardinal Robert of Geneva, a member of the conclave that elected Urban VI., and afterwards anti-Pope under the name of Clement VII. It is addressed to the Emperor Charles IV., and dated at Rome on the 14th of April, 1378, six days after the election of Urban, and almost four months before the publication by the seceding Cardinals of the manifesto of Anagni (Aug. 9, 1378). It is needless to dwell upon the importance of this document. The author, one of the Cardinals who were present at the famous Conclave, in view of his subsequent career, cannot be charged with undue partiality to Urban. He was not some gossiping courtier, but a man of dignity and authority, in fact one of the foremost members of the Apostolic College. The letter is addressed to the Emperor. What better guarantee could we have that it was written with care and deliberation and with due regard to the truth? The date of the document, also, is a claim to our confidence. It was written on the 14th of April, 1378. Six days had passed since the wild scenes of excitement and confusion that attended the Conclave. The passions of the mob had been calmed since the 9th of April; peace and order had reigned at Rome since that day on which the Cardinals who had fled to the Castle of St. Angelo, joined the newly-elected Pope at the Vatican. Urban's authority was of too recent creation to make him an object of fear to the Cardinals; he was not yet crowned nor installed as Bishop of Rome in the Lateran. That ceremony took place on Easter

Sunday, April 18th, four days after Robert's letter was written. Even so impulsive a man as Urban VI., was unlikely to resort to threats and violence before his coronation, though we know from Deitrich of Niem that he broke loose the day after. It is safe to assume that the letter was not dictated by fear and force; on the other hand the writer was as yet free from the passions and feelings that later set him up as the the opponent of Urban. We see that everything about the letter, the author, the address and the date, stamps it as a document of exceptional importance. We shall now let the document speak for itself; it is contained in "Codex Vaticanus," 4924, p. 1., and reads as follows:

(Letter of the Cardinal of Geneva on the nomination and election of our lord Pope Urban the Sixth):

"Most serene Prince and dearest Lord cousin: after the decease of our Lord Pope Gregory XI., of happy memory, which I announced to your Serenity in tearful terms in a former letter, when, ten days having elapsed after his death, according to the rule prescribed by the Canon Law, the other Lords Cardinals who were here and I were shut up in conclave, we unanimously cast our votes for the Archbishop of Bari then, the supreme pontiff now, by birth a Neapolitan, who was acting for my lord, the Cardinal of Pampeluna, Apostolic Vice-Chancellor then absent, in the curia of the said my lord, and on the eighth of the month in conclave we elected him to the apostleship, there being a delay of a single night only, because the Romans would not agree to a longer delay in the said Conclave. He was called Urban VI., being *M[agister] domesticus et apostolicus*, before his elevation, although now raised from the lowest rank to the highest. His coronation has been set for the feast of the Resurrection of our Lord, which is close at hand. Now he (Urban VI.) has great hopes of Your Serenity, and thinks that as Your Serenity has always been a son and a helping arm to his predecessors, Your Majesty ought to continue to be likewise to him. And I find him very well disposed, both in matters touching Your Serenity and your Most Serene Son, about whom I have several times conversed with him most earnestly; so much so that if he will carry out what he said, as I hope will be the case, he will happily despatch the business of your said Most Serene Son. To bring this about I shall not fail to urge him with all my endeavors, and to this end Master Conrad, the Secretary of Your Serenity, is working in a praiseworthy manner with all his skill. I always commend myself to Your Serenity, whom may the Almighty preserve happily and in conformity with my wishes. Written at Rome on the 14th day of April."

On account of the importance of the document, our readers will be pleased to have the Latin original.

(Littera[1] Gebennensis ad imperatorem Karolum de commendatione et creatione domini Urbani pape sexti):

"Serenissime princeps et domine consanguinee Karissime. Post felicis recordationis occasum domini nostri Gregorii pape XI., quem per alias litteras meas serenitati vestre lacrimabiliter nunciavi, aliis dominis meis cardinalibus et me hic existentibus, revolutis X. diebus post obitum secundum iuris canonici ritum, clausis in conclavi in archiepiscopum Barensem tunc, nunc summum pontificem, natione Neapolitanum, qui dómini mei cardinalis Pampilonensis vice-cancellarii apostolici absentis vices gerebat in curia dicti domini[2] mei et cetera unanimiter direximus voces nostras eundem ad apostolatum eligentes VIII. die mensis huius in conclavi solummodo unius noctis[3] mora protracta, quod Romani in longioris temporis in dicta conclavi moram consentire noluerunt. Vocatus est Urbanus sextus m[agister] dum erat in minoribus, domesticus et apostolicus quamvis de gradu infimo nunc sublimatus ad supremum, cuius coronacio in paschate resurrexcionis domini proxime venture est ordinata celebrari, Ipse enim de serenitate vestra multum sperat et quod sic aliis predecessoribus suis eadem serenitas filia fuerit et iuvaminis brachium singulare sic in eum constanter debeat maiestas vestra. Et quonium tum et[4] in factis tangentibus serenitatem vestram et serenissimum natum vestrum super quibus cum eo strictissime pluries sum locutus ipsum reperio dispositum valide bene adeo quod si opera verbis confirmaverit, sicut spero, negocium dicti serenissimi nati viri feliciter expediet. Ad cuius expedicionem toto conamine meo ipsum sollicitare non desistam, in quibus et Magister Conradus serenitatis vestre secretarius cum omni sollertia commendabiliter laborat, recommendans me semper serenitate vestre, quam conservet Omnipotens feliciter et votive. Scriptum Rome die XIII. Aprilis."

This letter, the reader will observe, while adverting to the pressure brought upon the Cardinals to shorten the conclave, gives not even the slightest hint of any violence curtailing the liberty of the participants. Moreover, the relation of the writer to the new Pope, as set forth therein, excludes the idea of the letter having been written under intimidation. He speaks of several confidential conversations with Urban and suggests to the Emperor that he is not without influence with the newly-chosen Sovereign pontiff. Not a word in the document suggests a doubt of the legality of his election.

But is the document authentic? Its preservation in the Vatican Library is in itself an argument in favor of its authority. But

[1] *Ruperti* is added by a later hand in other ink.
[2] *Cardinalis* is written above in different ink.
[3] In the MS. *spacio* is added in different ink.
[4] In the MS. *est.*

this is not the only argument that Pastor submits. A "Chronicle of the Popes of the Fifteenth Century," published by Fincke in Mgr. De Waal's *Romische Quartalschrift für Archæologie and Kirchengeschichte*, vol. iv., pp. 340–62, contains an account of the rise of the Great Schism, which betrays undoubted acquaintance with our document. "In his day," says the chronicler, "began a most serious schism, because after his election some Cardinal wrote to the Emperor Charles that 'Urban has been unanimously elected on Thursday, the 8th of April, and that on account of the Romans they had remained in conclave only one night,' and answered the aforesaid Emperor, who was then pressing him to raise his son Wenczelaus, now king of Bohemia, to the dignity of Emperor, that 'they would work towards this end with all their endeavors.' This letter is most carefully preserved in the archives of our side." [1].

A speech intended to be delivered by Lamprecht, bishop of Bamburg, on behalf of the Emperor Charles at the imperial diet in the year 1378, also mentions letters written hy Cardinals on Urban's election. "And on this point," says Lamprecht, "the Emperor has the letters of many Cardinals, some of which are autographs, and which the Emperor has ordered to be carefully preserved."

The authenticity of our letter is fully established by these citations. To make assurance doubly sure, Conrad of Wesel, the imperial ambassador mentioned in the letter, a bitter partisan of Clement VII., also refers to the document.[2] But Conrad impugns its value as testimony, by declaring that the letter was written under stress of intimidation. Urban, says Conrad, ordered Robert of Geneva to write the letter some time after his coronation, and in it to give an account both of his canonical election and of his coronation. Now the letter bears date April 14th; the coronation took place April 18th; Conrad's statement of the contents of the letter is incorrect, therefore, in a matter of great importance. He cannot have had a true copy of the document before him, or if he had, his truthfulness must be measured by his accuracy. Indeed, Conrad's statement was made a considerable time after the occurrence in question, and his report is dictated by profound partisanship. In view of its incorrectness and animus, therefore, and the date of its preparation, Conrad's report is entitled to little credence. If to this we add the internal evidence of Robert's letter, which, as we have seen above, represents the writer as on confidential terms with the Pope, it seems too strong an imputation on the character of Robert as a man to believe that his letter was dictated by fear.

[1] Fincke, *Chronicle of the Popes*, 347–8.

[2] *Gayet*, ii., P. J., 169 ff.

Pastor has found another document of much importance, bearing upon the election of Urban VI. This he purposes to publish in full before long, but he has made considerable use of it in his version of Urban's election and the events immediately succeeding. It is a report of Bishop Nicholas of Viterbo. In it he gives the opinion of the Cardinal d' Aigrefeuille, who like Robert of Geneva, had been a member of the conclave. The bishop's words are as follows:

"I went to my lord the Cardinal d' Aigrefeuille and begged him to tell me the truth for the salvation of my soul, because I did not intend to acknowledge as Christ's vicar one who was not Christ's vicar, and appealed to him to enlighten me on this point, as on the day of judgment. Then he answered me: 'Have no doubt, for surely since St. Peter's time no one sat in St. Peter's chair with greater right than he. Therefore you are wrong to hesitate so much.'"

We regret that Prof. Pastor has so far been unable to publish the Bishop of Viterbo's report in full; but even the fragment above given, if we bear in mind the character and opportunities of the speaker and the solemnity of the assurance given, must carry great weight.

We have laid these important and apparently heretofore unpublished statements before our readers. They can draw their own inferences.

CHARLES G. HERBERMANN.

[It cannot be denied that this new document unearthed by the diligence of Dr Pastor deals a heavy blow to the pretensions of Clement VII., and coming, as it does, so closely upon the blow dealt by the publication of the similar letter of the Cardinal of Florence, written to his former teacher on the same day (April 14, 1378), with this epistle of the Cardinal of Geneva, it may almost be pronounced a *coup de grace*. Florence had, indeed, parried the attack of the Urbanists when they confronted him with his letter, by affirming that it was entirely the work of his secretary, whom he had commissioned to convey the news of Urban's election to his old friend, and whose communication he had signed without taking the trouble to notice how it had been worded. Such an evasion could have no place as regards a letter written to the Emperor, and dealing with such important subjects as a papal election and the succession to the empire. Grateful, therefore, to Prof. Herbermann for the flattering terms in which he has alluded to our article, we are even more grateful to him for having brought to our notice this new and important link in that chain of evidence which is ever more firmly establishing the legitimacy of Urban's election. It may not be improper to remark that this juridical question did not come within the scope of our article, which was purely historical and intended to be the first of a series narrating the Great Schism. Dealing with a period of confusion, we strove to place our readers in the same perplexed frame of mind, as to the right and wrong of either side, in which the most learned and holy men of that age found themselves. To have approached the subject with preconceived opinions, would have destroyed the historical interest. We have not since been able to command sufficient leisure to continue our task, though we had collected a great deal of literature bearing on the subject.]

J. F. LOUGHLIN.

Scientific Chronicle.

SYSTEMS OF NUMERATION.

The Plea.

Numeration as it Should Be.

The *duodecimal* system of numeration should be adopted to the exclusion of the *decimal* and every other. This is our thesis; and we will now indicate briefly some of the more important proofs that may be used to sustain it. Of course, we claim no originality, and seek no patent either for the idea or the proofs; but we would wish to see this matter taken up for concerted action by enough gallant soldiers, enlisted under the banner of the Duodecimal, to carry him on to victory, and crown him king in the great land of Arithmos.

An article which appeared in the *Educational Review* for November, 1891, from the pen of Professor William B. Smith, of the University of Missouri, treats this matter pretty fully. We have taken the liberty of borrowing from it a good deal of what follows, and also of modifying some minor details of the proposed scheme; but we feel confident that the Professor will not take this amiss, as we will not take it amiss should some one see fit to modify for the better what we have written. Be this as it may, the grand central idea, the complete triumph of the duodecimal system must come; it is on the way:

> "Then let us pray that come it may,
> As come it will for a' that,
> That youth at school no more shall *grieve*
> O'er 'rithmetic and a' that."

The battle is on now between the only great rivals, the *decimal* and the *duodecimal*, the former of which has the great advantage of being *in possession;* the latter has only its own intrinsic excellence on which to rely.

The requisites for a good system of numeration are principally the following:

1. It must be thoroughly *systematic*, down to the very marrow of its bones. This implies that it must admit of no irregularities, no exceptional cases, no chance of doubt as to meaning in any case, no confusion; and that it should be so clear that, once started on the track, you can go on to any number without fear of failing or faltering. This first requisite can be fulfilled only by making the value of a symbol depend on its position, according to a geometrical series. On this score any of the systems, from the *binal* upwards, could claim admittance; but the Hebrew, Greek, and Roman notations will have to be irrevocably excluded, and we will have none of them.

2. Whatever the system adopted, the expression for large numbers should be reasonably concise. This condition throws out immediately all the systems described above from the *unal* to the *octaval* at least, as may be easily seen by reference to the table already given. The realization of this condition depends upon the value of the *base* chosen; the larger the base, the fewer will be the digits required to represent a given number, and the higher the number to be represented, the more this virtue of the base will assert itself. Thus to represent ten in the *decimal* system requires two digits (*i.e.*, 10), to represent a million, seven digits are necessary (*i.e.*, 1,000,000); but, if our *base* were one-hundred (*centesimal* system), *ten* would be represented by *one* digit and a *million* would be represented by *four* (*i.e.*, 1000). But we must not exaggerate here, as the larger the base the greater the number of separate symbols to be invented, and kept perfectly distinct from each other under every condition of careless writing, and bad penmanship, and poor mnemonics. This consideration prohibits us from adopting as a base, though otherwise excellent, such a number as *sixty* or even *twenty-four*, while any base between *twelve* and *twenty-four* must be rejected for reasons given below.

In regard to conciseness the decimal system is fairly good, but the duodecimal is measurably better. Thus, all numbers below 144 (decimal system) are expressed in the duodecimal by *two* figures at most; all below 1728, by *three* figures; all below 20,736, by *four;* all below 248,832, by *five;* and so on.

3. In the third place, the perfection of a system of numeration depends on the facility which it offers for the handling of its fractions. Two points of view are possible here. We may consider the merits of a system merely as a system of numbers, as such, or as a system to be applied to the various needs of business, trades, arts, and manufactures. From either point of view the duodecimal system is far in advance of the decimal. Vulgar fractions may, it is true, be expressed with perfect accuracy in any of the regular systems. Thus $\frac{1}{11111111111}$, $\frac{1}{1100}$, $\frac{1}{110}$, $\frac{1}{80}$, $\frac{1}{22}$, $\frac{1}{20}$, $\frac{1}{15}$, $\frac{1}{14}$, $\frac{1}{13}$, $\frac{1}{12}$, $\frac{1}{11}$, $\frac{1}{10}$, are a dozen equally accurate ways of expressing, each in its own system, the value *one-twelfth*. But vulgar fractions are time-consuming, brain-benumbing devices. In order to *add* together several fractions, you will usually have to *divide*, *multiply*, again *divide* and *multiply*, then *add*, and *divide* again. To *subtract*, the same number of operations are required. To *multiply* or *divide* fractions is slightly simpler, only two multiplications and one division being necessary in each case. To raise to powers and extract roots requires at least twice as much labor as in whole numbers, and when we have fractions and whole numbers together, it is worse yet. The well-known lines of an unknown genius (only one word having been altered) are not inappropriate:

> "Multiplication is vexation,
> Division is as bad;
> The Rule of Three, it puzzles me,
> And *fractions* set me mad."

Now, when fractions are written as sub-powers of the *base* of your system, and when they come out even, all this waste and confusion is avoided; as when we write 0.5 for $\frac{1}{2}$ or 0.1875 for $\frac{3}{16}$. Then addition is addition and nothing more, subtraction is only subtraction, and so of other operations.

But as there is never any great loss without some slight gain, so we suppose there can be no great gain without some slight loss, and in this connection we come across the snag of what are called *interminate*, or *circulating*, or *recurring* fractions, *i.e.*, fractions which cannot be expressed *accurately* with any finite number of digits. An example of this is the fraction *one-third*, which, *decimally*, becomes 0.3333 . . . . etc. to no end. Now, operations performed on these recurring fractions as such, can never give us exact results, but only approximations, and this is a serious defect. And although we can *calculate* their exact value, still these endless tail-ends are great nuisances. No system can be entirely free from them, but the fewer there are of them in any given system, the more perfect is that system. Now of the first eleven natural divisions of unity (viz. $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{5}$, $\frac{1}{6}$, $\frac{1}{7}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{9}$, $\frac{1}{10}$, $\frac{1}{11}$, $\frac{1}{12}$), *eight* become recurring fractions in the *binal*, in the *quaternal*, in the *sextal* and in the *octaval* systems; *nine* in the *ternal* and *nonal* systems; *ten* in the *quinqual*, *septimal* and *undecimal* systems. To propose any one of them as a practical system of numeration, would therefore be simply an insult to humanity.

But two remain, and to show their respective merits, we will give a tabular statement.

The first column of the following table is a list of ordinary vulgar fractions; in the second column we have the corresponding *decimal* fractions; in the third the corresponding *duodecimal* fractions.

	Decimals.	Duodecimals.
$\frac{1}{2}$	= 0.5	= 0.6
$\frac{1}{3}$	= 0.333'3'.....	= 0.4
$\frac{1}{4}$	= 0.25	= 0.3
$\frac{1}{5}$	= 0.2	= 0.'2497'.....
$\frac{1}{6}$	= 0.16'6'.....	= 0.2
$\frac{1}{7}$	= 0.'142857'.....	= 0.'186t35'.....
$\frac{1}{8}$	= 0.125	= 0.16
$\frac{1}{9}$	= 0.111'1'.....	= 0.14
$\frac{1}{10}$	= 0.1	= 0.1'2497'.....
$\frac{1}{11}$	= 0.09'09'.....	= 0.111'1'.....
$\frac{1}{12}$	= 0.083'3'.....	= 0.1

In this table, when a fraction is followed by dots, the meaning is that

the figure or group of figures included between inverted commas (‘ ’) is to be repeated to infinity to get the accurate value. Of these there are *six* in the *decimals*, and only *four* in the *duodecimals*, giving a gain of 50 per cent. for these first eleven fractions, and a still greater gain if we were to continue the list further, in favor of the *duodecimal*. Nor is this all, for, among the *five* decimal fractions which come out without a remainder, only *three* in the decimals (0.5, 0.2, 0.1) are written with one digit each, while in the duodecimals, *five* (0.6, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1) enjoy that advantage. Again, in the *decimals*, *one* of them requires *three* digits (0.125), while among the *duodecimals* none has more than two; all of which, summed up, gives in the duodecimal system, another saving of time and labor of about 20 per cent. This advantage is also kept up when we go on to still lower fractions.

Furthermore, the fractions we need oftenest, and use most ($\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{6}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{9}$, $\frac{1}{12}$), are the very ones which are not *repeaters* in the *duodecimal* system; while of the *seven* named above, the *decimal* system shuts off four (viz., $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{6}$, $\frac{1}{9}$, $\frac{1}{12}$), and gives us instead, the $\frac{1}{5}$ and the $\frac{1}{10}$, neither of which is of any practical use.

These advantages all hold good for all multiples of these fractions, as, for $\frac{2}{3}$, $\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{5}{6}$, $\frac{7}{8}$, $\frac{8}{9}$, $\frac{11}{12}$ and others, all of which, in the *duodecimal* system steer clear of the rock of infinite tails.

Another advantage of the *duodecimal* system is in the higher degree of accuracy obtained by the use of an equal number of digits, in the case of approximations.

Thus, the greatest error committed by dropping all *decimals* beyond the second place, is less than $\frac{1}{100}$, but in *duodecimals* it is less than $\frac{1}{144}$; dropping all beyond the third place gives a maximum error of less than $\frac{1}{1000}$ in the one and less than $\frac{1}{1728}$ in the other; and dropping all beyond the fourth place less than $\frac{1}{10000}$ and less than $\frac{1}{20736}$. Here, the *duodecimal* error is less than half the *decimal* error. Once more, the maximum error committed by stopping at the seventh *decimal*, in say a table of logarithms is less than $\frac{1}{10000000}$, but in *duodecimals* the error would be reduced to less than $\frac{1}{3583^{1}1808}$; a degree of accuracy nearly four-fold greater.

These, and other advantages which want of space forbids us to dwell on, prove that the *duodecimal* is theoretically, at least, superior to the *decimal* system.

Let us now take a look at the more practical side of the question, which is of course founded on the theoretical.

It is clear that for an everyday, working system no prime number, as 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, would be at all suitable as a base, and *that* precisely on account of its indivisibility, while 4, 6, 8, and 9 must be rejected for reasons already given; it is also clear that a base greater than 12 would be inconvenient on account of the number of symbols required. The claims, therefore, of the decimal and duodecimal systems are the only ones that need be considered.

The practical value of the duodecimal system depends mainly on two things, the first of which is its slightly greater conciseness, the second

the superior divisibility of its base. We have already sufficiently called attention to the question of conciseness, and will add here merely that we do not consider it, if taken alone, of very great importance. Indeed, if that had been the only grounds of a plea for the duodecimal, the present article, would never have been written. The second, however, is of altogether greater weight.

The number *ten* can be factored into 2×5, and no further. Consequently the only decimal fractions that will not be repeaters are those which come from the vulgar fractions $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{5}$, and from the powers and products of these, as $\frac{1}{2} = 0.5$, $\frac{1}{5} = 0.2$; $\frac{1}{4} = 0.25$, $\frac{1}{8} = 0.125$; $\frac{1}{16} = 0.0625$; $\frac{1}{25} = 0.04$; $\frac{1}{125} = 0.008$; $\frac{1}{2}\times\frac{1}{5} = \frac{1}{10} = 0.1$; $\frac{1}{8}\times\frac{1}{125} = 0.001$, etc. . . .

On the other hand *twelve* can be factored into three different groups: 2×6, or $2\times2\times3$, or 3×4, so that we have 2, 3, 4, and 6 as separate factors. Hence the fractions $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{6}$, will give even duodecimal fractions; they are 0.6, 0.4, 0.3 and 0.2 respectively. All their powers will be just as obliging, as $\frac{1}{8} = 0.16$, $\frac{1}{9} = 0.14$ $(\frac{1}{16}) = 0.09$ $(\frac{1}{27}) = 0.054$ $(\frac{1}{81}) = 0.0194$ $(\frac{1}{64}) = 0.023$ $(\frac{1}{256}) = 0.0069$, etc.; and all the products of any of these will go and do likewise, as $\frac{1}{2}\times\frac{1}{9} = (\frac{1}{18}) = 0.08$, $\frac{1}{3}\times\frac{1}{4} = (\frac{1}{12}) = 0.1$, $\frac{1}{8}\times\frac{1}{9} = (\frac{1}{72}) = 0.02$ $(\frac{1}{16}\times\frac{1}{27} = \frac{1}{432}) = 0.004$. The fractions just mentioned, $\frac{1}{16}$, $\frac{1}{27}$, etc., *which are enclosed in parentheses* are in decimal notation.

This divisibility of the base in the duodecimal system is therefore more than twice as prolific in useful results as that of the decimal system, and gives it a vast advantage over the latter; an advantage which renders it admirably fitted not only to be *the* system of numeration for arithmetical work in general (because, as we have seen, it is relatively free from repeating fractions), but also fits it to be the foundation of a complete structure of multiples and subdivisions in the everyday matter of weights and measures of all kinds. Well, then, let us reform.

The first step towards a reform in any matter, consists in acknowledging our sinfulness. In the matter of weights and measures our ancestors were terribly sinful, not morally perhaps, but intellectually, arithmetically, scientifically, and they have transmitted their sins, not to the third and fourth generations but to the thirty-third and thirty-fourth. To show this we will take up that one book which of all others we loved most dearly in the days that are long gone by, our Arithmetic. We turn the fond pages till we come to certain Tables of Weights:

1. Troy Weight.

24 grains (gr.)	=	1 pennyweight (dwt.).
20 pennyweights	=	1 ounce (oz.).
12 ounces	=	1 pound (lb.).

2. Apothecaries' Weight.

20 grains	=	1 scruple (℈).
3 scruples	=	1 drachm (ʒ).
8 drachms	=	1 ounce (℥).
12 ounces	=	1 pound (℔).

3. Avoirdupois Weight.

16 drachms	= 1 ounce (oz.).
16 ounces	= 1 pound (lb.).
28 or 25 pounds	= 1 quarter (qr.).
4 quarters	= 1 hundredweight (cwt.).
20 hundredweights	= 1 ton (T.).

The arithmetic then goes on to give some explanations. "Troy Weight," it says, "is used in weighing gold, silver, jewels, liquors, etc., and for ingredients used in philosophical experiments." How "*jewels*" and "*liquors*" got together, what the "*etc.*" may mean (mayhap red-herrings' eyes), what that word "*ingredients*" may signify, are questions outside the range of our finite knowledge. "Apothecaries' weight is used by apothecaries and chemists in mixing medicines, but drugs are bought and sold by avoirdupois weight." So! But the book forgets to tell us how apothecaries and chemists are bought, sold, and mixed. "By avoirdupois weight, coarse and bulky goods are weighed, and *all* the common necessaries of life," such things presumably as cabbage, chewing-gum, base-balls, cigarettes, tooth-picks, and the like (liquors and jewels of course excepted).

Here, then, are the three systems of weights in actual use among beings supposed to be endowed with reason. The first and second agree in two points only, viz., in the number of ounces (12) in the pound, and in the number of grains (480) in the ounce, but they reach the latter result by different roads. From these data luckily the number of grains in the pound turns out, in both cases, to be the same, *i.e.*, 5760.

The third, the avoirdupois, agrees with nothing except itself, and even with that but poorly. Some one, peace to his mud, has said that boys are liars by constitution. We don't believe it, for we remember having been boys ourselves; but when the boy is told by his infallible school-marm, backed up by the infallible arithmetic, that 28 pounds make *one-quarter* of a *hundredweight*, is he to be blamed if his eye for truth takes on a permanent cast? The lie will be four times as big when you tell him that one-hundred-and-twelve pounds make one-hundredweight. Is this the way to instil a spirit of truthfulness into the minds of the rising generation? True, our American arithmetics have corrected this, but it is taught yet to millions of youth in other lands.

We are not done with this avoirdupois weight yet, for we would like to know, not from mere curiosity, but for real practical purposes, how many grains it has to the pound. The "table" is silent, but a supplementary note will tell us that the number is 7000, so with slate and pencil, we figure out that the avoirdupois pound is equal to $1\frac{31}{144}$ lbs. troy, while the troy ounce, to turn the tables again, is equal to $1\frac{17}{175}$ ounce avoirdupois. After that, show us in all this broad land, the boy or girl, or even the woman or man who can tell us, off-hand, how many grains there are in an ounce, and how many there are in a drachm, avoirdupois. *We* know, because we have just made the calculation; but before you look at the answers, just shut your eyes, and hold your breath, and see if you are ready to answer; but don't all speak at once,

please. Even if you should happen to know the former, you will almost surely miss the latter. The answers are: Four-hundred and thirty-seven and a half (437½) grains in the ounce and twenty-seven and eleven-thirty-seconds ($27\frac{11}{32}$) grains in the drachm. What a mess!

We turn now to our measures of length. This ought to be a straightforward business, and we look up, if perchance a ray of light may dawn upon us here. A glance at the "table" soon dispels the illusion, for,

3 barleycorns or 11 lines or 12 lines	= 1 inch.
12 inches	= 1 foot.
3 feet	= 1 yard.
5½ yards	= 1 rod, perch, or pole.
40 rods	= 1 furlong.
8 furlongs	= 1 mile.
3 miles	= 1 league.
60 geographical miles	= 1 degree on the equator, or on a meridian.
69⅙ statute miles (about)	= 1 degree.

Ah, that poor little inch that don't know whether it is made of barleycorns or lines, or, if so, of how many. Then the idea of making a mixed number (5½) of one denomination equal to the unit of the next is unworthy of the intelligence of a Hottentot or Bushman.

Belonging under the head of Linear Measure, we have another table made expressly, it seems, for tailors and milliners, which starts out unblushingly with a mixed number, thus:

2¼ inches	= 1 nail (kind not stated).
4 nails	= 1 quarter.
4 quarters	= 1 yard.

This is nice, but read on:

3 quarters	= 1 ell Flemish.
5 quarters	= 1 ell English.
6 quarters	= 1 ell French.

And so the poor tailor or milliner must find out whether his customer is a Fleming, or an Englishman, or a Frenchman before he can know how much material he must give him for an ell. How about it if the customer had already been naturalized? What absurd methods and measures!

When we come to Square Measure, we expect to find the absurdities increase in proportion to the square, and we will not be disappointed, for we get:

30¼ square yards	= 1 square rod.
Or 272¼ square feet	= 1 square rod.

To begin with square inches, square feet, square yards, and square rods is natural under the circumstances and innocent enough, but as soon as that is over we lose our way and strike off into what has no existence in Linear Measure at all, viz., roods and acres, for:

40 square rods = 1 rood.
4 roods = 1 acre.
So that 160 square rods = 1 acre.

Therefore the side of a square whose area is one acre must be $\sqrt{160}$ rods, which gives us 12.6491 . . . . rods. The dots indicate that we have not *finished* the operation; neither do we intend to do so, for it would take too long. What we have struck here is not merely a case of a repeating decimal, as 0.333 . . . . which, though endless as a decimal, can nevertheless be expressed with perfect exactness by the vulgar fraction ⅓, or by the duodecimal 0.4. No, the disease here is deeper-seated yet, for the exact square root of 160 cannot be extracted at all. Of the several ways of showing this, one will be sufficient.

Reducing to prime factors we have $(2 \times 2)\ (2 \times 2)\ (2 \times 5) = 160$. Now, unless all the prime factors of a number can be grouped by twos, so that each group shall be a perfect square, then the number itself will not be a perfect square. But, of the three groups above, the first and second are perfect squares; the third $(2 \times 5 = 10)$ is not. For the final digit of a perfect square must be 1, or 4, or 5, or 6, or 9, or one of these followed by an even number of zeros. Now 10 does not fulfil either of these conditions; therefore, it is not a perfect square, and therefore 160 is not a perfect square. Hence, no created intelligence will ever be able to give us in rods, feet, or inches the exact length of the side of a square acre. And yet that acre is the *unit* of land measure for those who measure by rods, feet, and inches, and who expect one day to possess *all* the land.

In Cubic Measure we look for things solid. Well, the cubic inch, foot, and yard are derived honestly from the linear inch, foot, and yard, and are neither better nor worse than their origin; but when we have reached that point the table immediately branches off wildly into:

40 cubic feet of round timber }
Or 50 " " hewn " } = 1 ton or load.
128 cubic feet = 1 cord of wood.

How would it be if the timber were hewn *round*, as in masts and spars? But enough. The Anglo-Saxon tongue, rich as it is in strong terms, fails to supply words to characterize such a . . . . (no use, it won't come).

In Liquid Measure things ought to run smoothly, and, at first sight, they do seem a little better than elsewhere. Thus:

4 fluid ounces	= 1 gill.
4 gills	= 1 pint.
2 pints	= 1 quart.
4 quarts	= 1 gallon.
31½ gallons	= 1 barrel.
63 gallons (2 barrels)	= 1 hogshead.
2 hogsheads	= 1 pipe.
2 pipes	= 1 tun.

The gill, pint, quart, and gallon we can manage to swallow, but the

barrel, hogshead, pipe, and tun are myths and frauds and arithmetical falsehoods.

Moreover, as Liquid Measure is a measure of volume, we naturally want to know what relation there is between it and Cubic Measure, which is also a measure of volume. Now:

1 gallon = 231 cubic inches = 8.33888 . . . . lbs. distilled water.
Or 1 gallon = 277¼ " " = 10. " " "
Or 1 gallon = 282 " " = 10.171325 . . . . " " "
Or 1 gallon = various other measures. . . . .

As if this were not bad enough, we have a Dry Measure in which 32 quarts = 1 bushel, and as 4 quarts = 1 gallon, we infer that 8 gallons would be equal in volume to 1 bushel. Therefore the bushel should be:

$8 \times 231 = 1848$ cubic inches.
Or $8 \times 277\frac{1}{4} = 2220$ " "
Or $8 \times 282 = 2256$ " "

Yet it is not, for the bushel is defined, *by law*, as 2150.4 cubic inches; and then, by working back again, we would find our quarts and pints shaky, and we get bewildered entirely. There is then no simple relation between our Weights and Measures, although a futile attempt was made to establish something of the kind by the introduction of that insane *fluid ounce.*

We have not by any means exhausted the potential confusion of this matter; there are yet other tables in the arithmetic, and pages of others in the "Dispensatory," just crammed with similar incongruities, traps, and pitfalls; so much so that there is probably no sane man living who could give from memory all the curls and twists of our systems of Weights and Measures.

Knowing how they originated, it is not hard to account for their vagaries. They were not invented systematically, or built up on any prearranged plan, but just grew up, bit by bit, according to needs and whims of different tribes. Later on, every once in awhile, some king would try to disentangle the snarl by enacting laws to *regulate* the existing standards of Weights and Measures. Their intentions were honest enough, and they accomplished some little good, but it was only palliative, not curative. They did not go to the bottom of the evil, and half-way remedies are usually worthless. The evil here is in the jumble of inconsistencies in the denominations of the systems, taken either separately or in relation to one another, and in the absurdity of having more than one system anyhow. These are the arithmetical sins against good sense which have been handed down to us. Are we going to hand them down to posterity, or are we going to wipe them off the escutcheon of our race, and hand it along, clean and untarnished, to our successors?

A desperate attempt to remedy this state of confusion, in the matter of weights and measures, has indeed been already made by the French, in their metric system, and it becomes necessary for the better understanding of what follows, to say a word about it here. For standard of length they took what they supposed to be the *ten-millionth* part of a quadrant of a meridian, and called it the "*metre.*" We have Ameri-

canized the word to "*meter.*" Its value is 39.37043 . . . inches, about. Then, each denomination ascending is *ten* times as great as the preceding one, and a Greek prefix is used to indicate this. Each denomination descending is *one-tenth* as large as the preceding, and a Latin prefix does duty here. Thus:

ASCENDING.	DESCENDING.
10 meters = 1 *deca*meter.	0.1 meter = 1 *deci*meter.
10 decameters = 1 *hecto*meter.	0.1 decimeter = 1 *centi*meter.
10 hectometers = 1 *kilo*meter.	0.1 centimeter = 1 millimeter.
10 kilometers = 1 *myria*meter.	

And then their vocabulary seems to have given out.

Square Measure and Cubic Measure are derived directly from the Linear Measure, by the simple process of squaring and cubing, and no fag-end irregularities are tolerated.

For unit of weight they took a cubic centimeter of water, and called it a "gramme." We have shortened it to "gram." The prefixes for higher and lower denominations are the same as above, thus:

10 grams = 1 decagram.
10 decagrams = 1 hectogram, etc., etc.
And, 0.1 gram = 1 decigram.
0.1 decigram = 1 centigram, etc., etc.

For Liquid and Dry Measures, the French use their Cubic Measure, but since for ordinary work, the cubic centimeter is too small, and the cubic meter too large, they adopted as a convenient unit the cubic decimeter, which is a little more than our quart. This they called the "litre" (written "liter" by us, and pronounced lee-ter). From this they have decaliter, hectoliter, kiloliter, deciliter, centiliter, and any others that may be desired.

This system is in itself excellent because it establishes a clear, simple, obvious relation between weights and measures, so that we can pass from one to the other without labor, and at the same time be sure of perfectly exact results. This is the reason why it has been adopted by several countries, and by men engaged in scientific pursuits, the world over. Yet, although it has been legalized in the United States and in Great Britain and her colonies generally, more than twenty-five years, English-speaking people *will not* adopt it. The fact is that it has one serious, fatal drawback, that of having been founded on the decimal system of numeration. Had the duodecimal system been brought into use, and a metric system been founded on *it*, the result would have been as near perfection as the nature of numbers will admit of, and such a system, once started, would have gone on, conquering and to conquer, till not a rag of a decimal would be left floating over any spot on the face of the earth. It is time now. Come on comrades, fall in, and keep step in the ranks of a new and true intellectual progress.

Before entering into further details, it becomes necessary to make a digression in order to settle upon a nomenclature for our duodecimal system.

Clearly, it will not do to use the same word-combinations as in the effete decimal system, because the *meanings* would not correspond to the words. Thus, when we write 25 and pronounce it "twenty-five," we mean two tens + five, but in the duodecimal system 25 would mean two twelves + five, and we must have a method of naming which will indicate this fact. Now, we look upon it as a first principle that the names of a simple number (*i.e.*, the name of a single digit) should be a simple (not compound) word, and that the name of a combinational number (formed of two or more digits), should be derived from the names of the components. Most, if not all, systems of nomenclature have violated this principle, more or less.

In English the compound sign 11, which means *ten-one* (one-ten) is called *eleven* in which word there is no very *obvious* trace of either the word *ten* or the word *one*. The same is true with regard to *twelve*. We do not mean to say that these words did not mean originally one-ten, two-ten; we believe they did, but the relationship has been very much obscured. When we get to *thirteen*, the relation to *three-ten* is clear, and from that on to the end of numbers everything is lovely. The French, not content with these irregularities have allowed yet others to creep in. Thus they have names which, if translated literally, would read: sixty-nine (69), sixty-ten (70), sixty-eleven (71), etc., . . . up to sixty-nineteen (79), and then, four-twenty (80), four-twenty-one (81), etc., . . . up to four-twenty-nineteen (99), and even, though rarely used, six-twenty for 120.

In the scheme proposed below we intend to sweep away all irregularities of whatever kind, and to make the whole nomenclature perfectly regular and consistent. The *names* proposed may not be final; better ones may perhaps be found, and if any one has better to offer, let him stand forth and do so; but the *things* must stand. The table, we think, almost explains itself, yet, to forestall any possible hard feelings, we put, right here, what few remarks we have to make.

The figures in parentheses are of the decimal system, all the others are of the duodecimal. We use the ten digits (0 to 9 included) of the defunct decimal system, with their ancient names, except in the case of "seven" which is contracted to "sen." As remarked before, we use provisionally t for ten and l for eleven, which is shortened to "len." The next number being a combinational one, we use two symbols (10), and for a *name* we contract our present "twelve" to "tel." Then, to be systematically exact, we hitch on the zero, and hence 10 = tel-zero (formerly twelve), but in practice the word zero will be omitted, and this has been indicated by enclosing it in parentheses.

Having adopted "tel," we coin a new adjective, "*telimal*," and make a vow never to use that worn-out, unnecessary, cumbersome word, duodecimal, again. Also "telth" will take the place of twelfth, "senth" of seventh and "lenth" of eleventh. Another thing to be noticed is that in *true combinational names*, when the larger number precedes, addition is meant, as 16 = 10 + 6 = tel-six (the obsolete eighteen); and, on the contrary, when the smaller number precedes, multiplication is intended, as sixtel = six × tel = 6 × 10 = 60 (the obsolete seventy-two).

TELIMAL (DUODECIMAL) NOMENCLATURE.

(0)	0	Zero	(49)	41	fortel-one	(98)	82	eightel-two
(1)	1	one	(50)	42	" two	(99)	83	" three
(2)	2	two	(51)	43	" three	(100)	84	" four
(3)	3	three	(52)	44	" four	(101)	85	" five
(4)	4	four	(53)	45	" five	(102)	86	" six
(5)	5	five	(54)	46	" six	(103)	87	" sen
(6)	6	six	(55)	47	" sen	(104)	88	" eight
(7)	7	sen	(56)	48	" eight	(105)	89	" nine
(8)	8	eight	(57)	49	" nine	(106)	8t	" ten
(9)	9	nine	(58)	4t	" ten	(107)	8l	" len
(10)	t	ten	(59)	4l	" len	(108)	90	ninetel-(zero)
(11)	l	len	(60)	50	fiftel-(zero)	(109)	91	" -one
(12)	10	tel-(zero)	(61)	51	" -one	(110)	92	" two
(13)	11	tel-one	(62)	52	" two	(111)	93	" three
(14)	12	tel-two	(63)	53	" three	(112)	94	" four
(15)	13	tel-three	(64)	54	" four	(113)	95	" five
(16)	14	tel-four	(65)	55	" five	(114)	96	" six
(17)	15	tel-five	(66)	56	" six	(115)	97	" sen
(18)	16	tel-six	(67)	57	" sen	(116)	98	" eight
(19)	17	tel-sen	(68)	58	" eight	(117)	99	" nine
(20)	18	tel-eight	(69)	59	" nine	(118)	9t	" ten
(21)	19	tel-nine	(70)	5t	" ten	(119)	9l	" len
(22)	1t	tel-ten	(71)	5l	" len	(120)	to	tentel-(zero)
(23)	1l	tel-len	(72)	60	sixtel-(zero)	(121)	t1	" -one
(24)	20	twitel-(zero)	(73)	61	" -one	(122)	t2	" two
(25)	21	twitel-one	(74)	62	" two	(123)	t3	" three
(26)	22	" two	(75)	63	" three	(124)	t4	" four
(27)	23	" three	(76)	64	" four	(125)	t5	" five
(28)	24	" four	(77)	65	" five	(126)	t6	" six
(29)	25	" five	(78)	66	" six	(127)	t7	" sen
(30)	26	" six	(79)	67	" sen	(128)	t8	" eight
(31)	27	" sen	(80)	68	" eight	(129)	t9	" nine
(32)	28	" eight	(81)	69	" nine	(130)	tt	" ten
(33)	29	" nine	(82)	6t	" ten	(131)	tl	" len
(34)	2t	" ten	(83)	6l	" len	(132)	lo	lentel-(zero)
(35)	2l	" len	(84)	70	sentel-(zero)	(133)	l1	" -one
(36)	30	thirtel-(zero)	(85)	71	" -one	(134)	l2	" two
(37)	31	thirtel-one	(86)	72	" two	(135)	l3	" three
(38)	32	" two	(87)	73	" three	(136)	l4	" four
(39)	33	" three	(88)	74	" four	(137)	l5	" five
(40)	34	" four	(89)	75	" five	(138)	l6	" six
(41)	35	" five	(90)	76	" six	(139)	l7	" sen
(42)	36	" six	(91)	77	" sen	(140)	l8	" eight
(43)	37	" sen	(92)	78	" eight	(141)	l9	" nine
(44)	38	" eight	(93)	79	" nine	(142)	lt	" ten
(45)	39	" nine	(94)	7t	" ten	(143)	ll	" len
(46)	3t	" ten	(95)	7l	" len			
(47)	3l	" len	(96)	80	eightel-(zero)			
(48)	40	fortel-(zero)	(97)	81	" -one			

Of course the t's and the l's look strange. We are waiting for some artist to invent better forms.

To pass to numbers of a higher order than are found in the table we need a few new names. Prof. Smith suggests, and the suggestion seems an excellent one, to use "po" (power or position) with the Greek prefixes, di, tri, etc., for coefficients. Hence "dipo" would mean the second power of tel, *i.e.*, $10 \times 10 = 100$ (144 formerly). Next use Latin prefixes for telimal fractions, and you get as follows:

tel = 10.	telth = 10^{-1} = 0.1.
dipo = 10^2 = 100.	semipo = 10^{-2} = 0.01.
tripo = 10^3 = 1,000.	tertipo = 10^{-3} = 0.001.
tetrapo = 10^4 = 10,000.	quartipo = 10^{-4} = 0.00,01.
pentapo = 10^5 = 100,000.	quintipo = 10^{-5} = 0.00,001.
hexapo = 10^6 = 1,000,000.	sexipo = 10^{-6} = 0.00,000,1.
heptapo = 10^7 = 10,000,000.	septipo = 10^{-7} = 0.00,000,01.
octapo = 10^8 = 100,000,000.	octipo = 10^{-8} = 0.00,000,001.
ennapo = 10^9 = 1,000,000,000.	nonipo = 10^{-9} = 0.00,000,000,1.
dekapo = 10^t = 10,000,000,000.	decipo = 10^{-t} = 0.00,000,000,01.
endekapo = 10^l = 100,000,000,000.	undecipo = 10^{-l} = 0.00,000,000,001.
dodekapo = 10^{10} = 1,000,000,000,000.	dodecipo = 10^{-10} = 0.00,000,000,000,1.

This will probably be enough, upwards and downwards, for all practical purposes. If, however, any one should have need to count higher or lower, we would advise him to hire a clerk, who can be allowed to waste himself away in writing out Greek and Latin prefixes, to no end.

A word now about the *reading* of numbers in this system. Several ways will suggest themselves; we give one which we think short, clear and simple. For example, 3,8t6,2l1,794,052. Divide it into periods of three figures each, and then read:

Three dodeka, eight-ten-six enna, two-len-one hexa, sen-nine-four tripo, fiftel-two; requiring 22 syllables made up of 64 letters. Now, translating that number into its equivalent in the decimal system, we have 33,343,759,669,310 which is read: *Thirty-three trillions, three-hundred and forty-three billions, seven-hundred and fifty-nine millions, six-hundred and sixty-nine thousand, three-hundred and ten;* requiring 38 syllables made up of 134 letters. In this example, taken entirely at random, there is a clear gain of more than 42 per cent. in the reading and of more than 52 per cent. in the writing, by the use of the telimal system. In reading, the "po" is omitted whenever its omission will cause no ambiguity. End of the digression.

We return now to our weights and measures in order to show how they may be brought under the rule of the *Telimal.*

The first thing we need is a standard of length, but there is no use whatever in searching the earth and the skies for a so-called *natural* unit. Any handy length will do, and fortunately we have just such a one already, the yard, which is preserved with such infinite care by our own government as well as by that of Great Britain.

Taking that as a unit, and applying the telimal system, we have forthwith:

10 yards = 1 tel yard = (12 yards old style).
10 tel yards = 1 dipo yard = (144 yards old style),
10 dipo yards = 1 tripo yard = (1728 yards old style).
10 tripo yards = 1 tetrapo yard, etc., to any extent whatever.

The tripo yard would serve admirably as a unit for long distances, being nearly equal to our present mile.

1 yard = 10 telth yards = 1 yard.
1 telth yard = 10 semipo yards = 0.1 yard = (3 inches, old style).
1 semipo yard = 10 tertipo yards = 0.01 yard = ($\frac{1}{4}$ inch, old style).
1 tertipo yard = 10 quartipo yards 0.001 yard = ($\frac{1}{48}$ inch, old style),
etc., down to molecular and atomic dimensions.

The telth yard is just a handy length for ordinary small measures, while the semipo yard ($\frac{1}{4}$ inch) is employed constantly in every workshop in the land.

For square and cubic measures the same unit (the yard) squared or cubed, with its multiples and subdivisions, will be used.

Of these, the dipo yard square would be something over four of our acres. This should hardly be thought too large a unit for a country like this; or, at any rate, if you prefer, you can buy a quarter dipo yard instead of a whole one.

The telth yard cube would give a convenient unit for liquid and dry measure, being equal to 27 of our cubic inches, or just a little less than our pint. All higher and lower denomination would of course be telimal multiples and subdivisions of these.

For weights, the standard unit would be the weight of the unit of volume (the telth yard cube) of distilled water, at its maximum density; this would very nearly correspond to our present pound. Multiples and subdivisions as usual.

For a "*set of weights*" to be used with a balance, the 1, 2, 3, 6, would probably be the most convenient; for, taken either separately or by addition, they would serve for weighing anything from *one* up to the unit of the next higher rank inclusively. Thus,

With weight 1 we can weigh one = 1.
With weight 2 we can weigh two = 2.
With weight 3 we can weigh three = 3.
With weights 1 + 3 we can weigh four = 4.
With weights 2 + 3 we can weigh five = 5.
With weight 6 we can weigh six = 6.
With weights 1 + 6 we can weigh sen = 7.
With weights 2 + 6 we can weigh eight = 8.
With weights 3 + 6 we can weigh nine = 9.
With weights 1 + 3 + 6 we can weigh ten = t.
With weights 2 + 3 + 6 we can weigh len = l.
With weights 1 + 2 + 3 + 6 we can weigh tel = 10 (the unit of the rank above).

For larger numbers take 10, 20, 30, 60, and the same advantages of the greatest return from the least outlay, remains.

An important factor in the running of the machinery of this world is money. We are all naturally somewhat interested in the question of mono-metallism, bi-metallism, silver bills and the like, but these phases of the money question do not enter here. We are concerned just now with the arithmetic of money. All things considered, we think our telth pound of coin silver (len-telths fine), which is very near our present dollar, would be the best unit. Then divide and multiply that to your heart's content, but always telimally.

The coins or bills to be issued should be according to the scheme given above for weights, viz., the 1's, 2's, 3's, 6's of each rank. This would greatly facilitate the counting and reduce the handling of money; besides, silver coins could then be used for weights on a small scale.

The French, in their metric system, tried to get a grip on circular and time measure, but failed completely. We hope to be more successful.

In circular measure we have now,

Sixty seconds = one minute.
Sixty minutes = one degree.
Sixty degrees = one sextant.
Six sextants = one circle.

This is probably a remnant of an attempted *sexagesimal* system.

In time measure we have:

Sixty seconds = one minute.
Sixty minutes = one hour, and then we go wild again, for,
Twenty-four hours = one day.

Now, a day is measured by one turn in a circle of a point on the earth, and an every-day problem is to convert time into longitude; and yet the *words* which correspond to minute and second, do not mean the same *things*; for a minute of time equals fifteen minutes of longitude. Comment is unnecessary.

In our new system circular and time measures are the same. After mature consideration we have come to the conclusion that it will perhaps be better to take the semi-circumference as a unit instead of the entire circle. This granted, divide and subdivide that unit according to the telimal system, and you have:

Tel fourths (^{iv}) = 1‴ (= about 1/6 second, old style).
Tel thirds = 1″ (= about 2 seconds, old style).
Tel seconds = 1′ (= 25 seconds, old style).
Tel primes = 1° { grade (of time) (= 5 minutes, old style).
{ degree (of cycle) (= 1¼°, old style).
Tel { grades / degrees } = 1 hour (= 1 hour = 15°, old style).

$$\text{Tel hours} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ day} = 1 \text{ night (of time)} \ (= 12 \text{ hours, old style}). \\ 1 \text{ hemicycle (of circle)} \ (= 180^\circ, \text{ old style}). \end{cases}$$

If it were preferred to use the whole circumference as a unit, then each of the above values would be doubled. This would make the *hour* very long.

Holding close relationship with the foregoing is the division of the year. The day (as used now) is a *natural* division of time which man can neither lengthen nor shorten; the week of sen (old seven) days has been settled by higher legislation than ours, and it behooves us to leave it alone. The year is another natural unit of time, and its division into tel months falls in with our telimal system. The only regulating that should be attempted in this matter is to make the months of equal length by giving to each thirty days. There will then remain five days over in common years and six in leap-years. Let these be made legal holidays, belonging to no month, and bearing no interest, and let them be spaced at even distances throughout the year, as follows. We leave the numbers in decimal notation:

1 day New Year's Day.
January, 30 days.
February, 30 days.
1 day Leap-Year Day every fourth year.
March, 30 days.
April, 30 days.
1 day Spring (Vernal?) Day.
May, 30 days.
June, 30 days.
1 day Independence Day (put the "Glorious *old* Fourth" here).
July, 30 days.
August, 30 days.
1 day Autumn Day.
September, 30 days.
October, 30 days.
1 day Election Day every fourth year, but celebrate it every year.
November, 30 days.
December, 30 days.

This suggestion about the year is considered only as an ornament, and whether it be adopted or not, the telimal system will not suffer any loss.

In looking back over our "tables," we are struck with a curious fact, which seems to indicate that there always existed a natural longing for that number *twelve*.

The *old* multiplication tables always went to twelve times twelve. Then we have:

Twelve pence = 1 shilling.
Twelve lines = 1 inch.
Twelve inches = 1 foot.
Twelve ounces = 1 pound (in two systems).
Twelve units = 1 dozen.
Twelve dozen = 1 gross.
Twelve gross = 1 great gross.
Twelve hours = 1 day (often used thus).
Twelve signs = 1 zodiac.
Twelve months = 1 year.

Is it not by the *dozen* that you buy shirts, collars, cuffs, socks, eggs, cups and saucers, knives and forks, spoons, hardware, chemical-ware, handkerchiefs, buttons, candles, and dozens and dozens of the smaller articles of every-day use? No other number occurs anything like so often in the tables, except that most useful factor of twelve, viz., four; but ten and five are conspicuously absent. This shows that common sense, in spite of the heathen decimal, still succeeded, to some extent, in making itself heard. Who ever wanted to buy $\frac{1}{5}$ of a pound of tea, or $\frac{1}{10}$ of a gallon of molasses? The five and the ten, *i.e.*, the decimal system, is doomed, and the sooner it is knocked down and carried out the better.

To sum up, the telimal system has, among others, the following advantages over the decimal:

It is more concise; it has fewer repeating fractions and, therefore, less need of the crazy vulgar fractions; it is very much more exact in the matter of approximations; the divisibility of its base stamps it as the *natural* system of numeration; arithmetical operations in it are easier, especially multiplication; it has no perplexing tables to be learned and forgotten, or left, as is so often the case, unlearned altogether; it requires no multiplications or divisions to reduce from one denomination to another; it is just as easy, in it, to handle compound numbers of *any kind* as to work with abstract numbers; much of what to us is now hard and tedious work will be done with ease, even mentally, in the telimal system.

To the astronomer, the surveyor, the physicist, the chemist; the mechanical, the civil, the electrical engineer, the architect; to every one who uses an instrument of precision; to the machinist, the carpenter, to the business man, the teacher, the scholar; to every one who deals largely in figures, it would save more than one year in every tel years if the change were made.

And, after all, the change is not so very great. Two new symbols, three or four new names, a few Greek and Latin prefixes, and all is ready. A grown man would *understand* it at sight, be able to use it in a week or two, be perfect in it in a couple of months, *think* in it at the end of a year, and would bless God for the rest of his days for having fallen in with so superior a method of managing numbers. The schoolboy would grow fat on it, and know more arithmetic at tel years of age than his father did at twitel.

The only real difficulty in the way is the unlearning of the decimal system; and "the beast with *ten* horns" would make a hard fight, but that applies only to the unfortunates of this generation. "*Whatever man has done man may do.*" Six or seven centuries back all western Europe abandoned its old systems of numeration and adopted the decimal. That system has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Where should be the insurmountable difficulty in throwing it over now and in putting in its place the most perfect system which the nature of numbers will admit of, and which will never need replacing so long as the world endures—nor afterwards?

A century back France woke up and brushed away all her foolish old systems of measures and weights, introduced her metric system, and induced several other countries to do the like. In a short time everybody was talking "kilogrammes," "centimetres," "hectolitres," etc., or words to that effect, and yet no bones were broken over the matter, the literature of the country was not overthrown, nor was the science of mathematics destroyed. Yet the change proposed here is no more violent than was then brought about.

About the same time the United States gave up £, *s.*, *d.*, and introduced $, dimes, cents, without creating a revolution or stirring up any bad blood. The change proposed now is dipo, tripo, tetrapo times more useful, and the cost bears no proportion to the gain.

"Let us then be up and doing;"
Rouse ye now, ye valiant men,
The light of science still pursuing,
Thunder o'er the ranks of TEN.
Onward to the conflict press ye,
Bearing high the flag of TEL;
And may coming ages bless ye,
Proclaiming that ye have done well.

COMPLETION OF THE NIAGARA TUNNEL.

THIS subject has been sufficiently treated of in the daily journals, but since the ultimate end of the "daily" is usually the matutinal ignition of carboniferous materials in the grate of the culinary department of our homes, we have thought it well to give the matter a more secure and permanent resting place among the scientific "Notes" of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The utilization of the energy of falling water for industrial purposes is by no means a new idea. It has been known for ages, and has been in constant application in every land where the rivers flow down to the sea. Even the advent of steam machinery, with all its advantages, could not succeed in completely ousting the ancient water-wheels from their position; and much less has it been able to impede the progress of the modern improved turbine.

In the undershot wheel, the momentum of running water is utilized on the flat paddles of the wheel; but this is effected under very unfav-

orable conditions. In the breast-wheel the water acts merely by its dead-weight, in the buckets, on about one-quarter of the circumference, both the quantity of water and its leverage decreasing rapidly from the moment the water enters till it leaves the buckets. In the overshot wheel the water acts in like manner, by its weight, but this time on nearly one-half of the circumference, the leverage varying from zero to a maximum and back to zero again during each semi-revolution. In the turbine, advantage is taken of the vertical fall of the water in an enclosing tube, and of the reaction due to its exit in a nearly tangential direction. Here, weight, velocity of fall, and a constant maximum of leverage, conspire to produce rotation, and the result is a wonderfully efficient mechanism. Besides, the turbine requires but a small fraction of the space demanded by the older forms of water-wheels.

Water, when its energy has been used up, must, like everything else in this world, be got rid of; after doing its work it must pass away, and that part of the plant in which this takes place is called the *tail-race*. Men, with an eye to practical work, could not long look upon Niagara without asking themselves whether there might not be some way of putting to use a part, at least, of its tremendous energy. Naturally, the old-fashioned water-wheel was first thought of, and it has, indeed, been for a long time in use. The wild idea of hanging a wheel in the falling water itself was speedily abandoned; but the river was tapped about three-quarters of a mile above the fall, and the water led through a canal to a spot further down, where it tumbled over and made a little fall on its own account. This arrangement still exists. It is the *running* water of this canal which gives the power, and the amount obtainable depends on the difference of level between the inlet and the outlet. This, however, bears but a small proportion to the energy wasted after the water leaves the canal. Nevertheless, it has sufficed for the driving of as many mills as could be located on that three-quarter mile stretch.

But all this will soon be changed; the great tunnel is completed. This is not a railroad tunnel, though it would be large enough to accommodate a double track. It is merely the *tail-race* for the turbine wheels. It begins at water-level, below Suspension bridge, and continues nearly parallel with the river, at an average depth of 160 feet through the solid rock, right under the city of Niagara Falls. At its upper end an open shaft rises to the surface. Between this point and the river an inlet-canal has been built. It is 1500 feet long and 12 feet deep; at the river end it is 230 feet wide, but tapers to 150 feet at the shaft end. In the shaft are the wheel-pits, one of which, already completed, is 140 feet long by 18 feet wide, and 180 feet deep. In the bottom of the wheel-pits turbines will be placed whose axles will reach above the surface. The head of water on the turbines will be about 140 feet. Wheel-houses of brick, iron, and steel, will cover the pits, and will contain the machinery for the transmission of the power, in the shape of compressed air, and cables, and dynamos. The armatures of the dynamos will be connected directly to the axles of the turbines. Both turbines and dynamos will be the largest yet constructed in this country.

The tunnel is 21 feet high by 19 feet wide, in the shape of a horse-shoe. For fear of the wearing action of the water on the limestone of the tunnel, the latter has been lined with brick, except the last 100 feet near the outlet, where the lining is of heavy plates of steel.

Some anxiety has been expressed lest this drawing off of the water might injure the æsthetic value of the Falls. There seems to be no danger of this, for the turbines, when used to the full capacity of which the tunnel is capable, will not use more than 4 per cent. of the river water. That loss will not be noticeable. The total horse-power of Niagara Falls is estimated at 3,000,000. It has been said that, if the whole output of coal in the world were used in working steam-pumps, all together, they would scarcely be able to pump Niagara back as fast as it falls.

Of the 120,000 horse-power to be obtained from the turbines, 45,000 are booked for Buffalo, 18 miles away; 30,000 to other points in the vicinity, and the remainder is for rent to whosoever wants it. The price asked is remarkably low, being only $8.00 for 1 horse-power continuously, day and night, for a year.

A similar project is on foot on the Canadian side of the river, and is in the hands of the same company, and there can be no doubt now that both enterprises will be crowned with complete success.

THE LIGHTNING-BOLT.

We used, long ago, to call it *thunder-bolt*, and we really reverenced it as much under the old name as under the new. It matters little, however, which way you call it; it smells as sweet by one name as the other.

Nowbody doubts, nowadays, about the identity of lightning with electricity. We measure what electricity will do by the product of its units of pressure into its units of flow. This is analogous to what is done in computing the work done by steam. If steam is delivered under a known pressure, and at a known rate, we can tell what that steam will be able to do in a given time. So, if we know the electric pressure (called *volts*), and the rate of flow (called ampères), we can tell the horse-power developed.

Now, it has been calculated, from pretty fair data, that in a good lightning-bolt the pressure is upwards of 3,500,000 volts, and the rate of flow 14,000,000 ampères, and that the time occupied in getting in its work is the $\frac{1}{20000}$ of a second. The product of these three factors gives us 2,450,000,000 units of electrical energy. It takes 746 of these units to make one horse-power. The horse-power of our lightning-bolt is, therefore, 3,284,182. If it were kept up at this rate, and we could only catch it and store it up, and tame it down to be used when required, the question of fuel for heat, light, and motive power, need give the world no further trouble; and besides, the damages now caused by lightning would be averted. Here is a grand field, in fact, all out-doors, earth and skies included, open to some ingenious inventor.

ICE AND PROCESSES FOR ARTIFICIALLY MAKING IT.

I.

Summer and winter, with their alternations of heat and cold, have followed each other pretty regularly, over a good part of the earth, as long back as we can remember; possibly a good deal longer. As far as the winter was concerned our ancestors found themselves compelled, through sheer necessity, to take means to keep themselves from being frozen, but they do not seem to have given themselves much trouble about keeping themselves from melting in summer. The advance of civilization, with the enervating results of its comforts and luxuries, is, according to the physicians, making the people of each generation less able to bear with the vicissitudes of climate than were their predecessors. We must be kept warmer in winter and cooler in summer or else we begin to complain that life is not worth living. We do not remember to have read or heard about the storing of winter-ice for summer use by the North American Indians, nor even by the first white settlers, yet, nowadays, no well-regulated household can get along in the warm weather without its supply of ice. The vital question is, where it is to come from.

Naturally the first means to suggest itself would be to store up the surplus of the winter supply. This is indeed what we have been doing for a long time past, and the ice-crop is one of the most important harvests of the year. This method has, however, serious inconveniences. Probably more than one-half of the ice-crop of each season is melted before it reaches the spot where it is calculated to do most good. Besides, we have to take the ice as nature gives it, mud, miasms, animalculæ and all. We have seen ice taken, for domestic use, from water too filthy for bathing purposes, much less for drinking. It is now an exploded idea that dirty water can make clean ice. True, a part of the impurities, solid and gaseous, *may* be expelled by the act of freezing, but seldom or never the whole of them. We have seen bucketfuls of mud and muck taken from the bottom of an ice house when it was opened for a fresh supply of *pure* ice, and proportionally large quantities from a simple water cooler. If used only for refrigerating purposes, not for drinking, it matters less, but we Americans will not be content without our ice-cold drink in summer, no matter how much we offend against the laws of health. Well, if we must use ice in this way, let us at least have it clean and pure.

It was not, however, on this account, but because of the threatened failure of our ice-crop that a wag proposed to go up to Baffin's Bay and tow a few icebergs down and retail them in lots to suit customers along the coast. It was laughed at as a bit of fun, but the projector took it seriously, and proposed to prove by figures that it would pay. Several arguments, each sufficient of itself to disprove the whole scheme, might be brought forward, but a single one will suffice. A respectable iceberg will stand 100 feet out of water, and that means that its total height will

not be far short of 1000 feet. A lump of ice, just as any other solid body, must necessarily float with its longest axes horizontal; let its length and breadth then be, say, a half mile. Now, that lump would weigh over 200,000,000 tons. That might do if it could be all housed, but how much of it would be melted in the ocean, and how much in handling and transportation before being housed? How much of it would ever reach New Orleans, where it would be needed, at least as much as anywhere else? And besides, that block of ice would draw from 800 to 900 feet of water. Where then could it make harbor? Anyhow, since we are at it, let us hitch the United States Navy, or at least what there is of it afloat, to our iceberg, and see whether, in the currents of the ocean, the dog would waggle the tail, or the tail waggle the dog. We will not embark in the iceberg business just yet. But ice we must have, and pure ice if we can. How this may be had will be explained under a subsequent heading.

II. Ice-Machines.

Various methods have been employed for the artificial manufacture of ice, but they may all be reduced to three classes, the first purely mechanical, the second principally chemical, the third a combination of physical and mechanical.

1. Mechanical. When air is condensed by mechanical force it becomes heated, and that, too, just in proportion to the force employed. When condensed air is allowed to expand it does work, consequently heat is used up and the temperature of the air is lowered. This is more especially the case if this same air in expanding is made to do external work, as for example, in running an air-motor. If we used this air immediately after condensing it, that is, while still hot, the lowering of the temperature would just compensate the rise due to compression, and nothing would be gained. Instead of this the air after compression is cooled by being passed through pipes surrounded with cool running water. Then, after having been deprived of its heat of compression, if allowed to expand, as stated above, its temperature will descend in proportion to the amount of expansion. By this means temperatures as low as 80° below zero have been obtained. Now this air may be caused to circulate around a tank of water, the contents of which may thus be frozen. This method is, however, rather expensive for the actual production of ice. It serves a better purpose when used to cool spaces where a low, but not actually freezing, temperature is required, as in the preserving of meat on long sea voyages, and in vaults of breweries, etc.

2. Chemical. We have called the second method chemical, though chemists and physicists both claim it. They are probably both right, or at least partly so. It consists in freezing one body by the melting of another. Our ice-cream machine is an example in point. To be definite, we will take two pounds of chopped ice, the temperature of which will be 32° F., and with it mix intimately one pound of salt at the ordinary temperature, say 50° F. They will melt together, and the result-

ing mass will be at a temperature very near 0° F., much lower therefore than that of either of the constituents. This looks like a mystery at first sight, but it may be readily explained.

A solid body cannot become liquid without absorbing heat, and the heat which has been *used up* in the work of changing a solid into a liquid does not show on the thermometer. It seems to disappear in the body, and hence is called *latent* heat. For example, a pound of ice at 32° F. cannot be changed into a pound of water at 32° F., unless it can absorb as much heat as would, if properly applied, raise the temperature of another pound of water through 80° F. Now when ice and salt are placed in contact they will melt together, on account of *their attraction* for each other. Hence the chemist contends that the action lies in his department. On the other hand, in order to melt they must get heat, honestly if they can, but anyhow they must get it, and if you do not supply it in the shape of fire, they will take it from each other or from surrounding bodies. The heat which they steal becomes *latent, i.e.,* does not show up on the thermometer, and therefore something has become sensibly colder. If that something is cream and fixings you will have ice cream, if it is simply water, you will simply have ice. This method of manufacturing ice would be practically useless, for, first, you must have ice to begin with, and that is hardly fair; and moreover, there are scientists who hold that the amount of ice so manufactured could never even theoretically be greater than the amount consumed. With this opinion we beg respectfully to disagree, at least until further proofs are adduced. But, secondly, it takes a good deal of labor to mix that ice and salt thoroughly, so as to obtain the best results. Thirdly, you must use a very large quantity of salt, itself worth much more than the ice produced. It can indeed be recovered by evaporation of the water, but the space required for this, and the time and labor consumed, combine to render the whole process altogether too expensive.

However, we need not give up yet; since we have struck a principle, let us see what there is in it. When a solid dissolves in a liquid it becomes itself liquid, and according to what we have said, it must absorb heat in so doing. When true chemical combination takes place between the substances heat will be produced, and if that heat happens to be just enough to take the place of what has become latent, then there will be neither rise or fall of temperature. If the heat produced by the chemical action be more than enough for this, there will be a rise in temperature corresponding to the difference. If again, there be less heat evolved by the chemical action than that which becomes latent, or especially if there be only solution and *no* chemical action, there will be a fall of temperature, and that fall may be considerable.

About the best machine, working on these lines, was invented by Mr. Toselli, in Paris, France some 20 years ago. In this machine the lowering of the temperature was accomplished by the dissolving of nitrate of ammonia in water. It worked well enough on a small scale, and would produce a few pounds of ice at a time, but the output bore no

reasonable proportion to the labor and time spent, or to the mess it got up generally.

There may be a great deal of truth, but there is not much poetry, in writing the record of failures, and up to the point we have reached, there had been no real practical success. Let us turn to something better.

III. Physico-mechanical Processes.

Ice is now made on a commercial scale by the occlusion of heat, which takes place when a liquid passes to the gaseous state. The liquid employed in the earliest machines was water. The ice-machine of Carré was of this kind. Now, although the amount of heat rendered latent when water passes to the gaseous condition is about seven times as great as that which becomes latent when ice becomes liquid, yet, water evaporates too slowly to make the machine work satisfactorily. To aid it, Carré made use of an exhausting pump, and the vapor of the water was besides brought into contact with strong sulphuric acid, by which it was rapidly absorbed. The acid was diluted by this process and had to be removed and replaced by a fresh supply. This in itself would be a fatal objection to any attempt to work the machine on a large scale.

We come now to the really successful ice-machine. There are many liquids which when evaporating produce intense cold, but we need not enumerate them now. The one which has given the most satisfaction and is displacing all others is liquid ammonia. We do not mean the ammonia water of the drug store; *that* is merely a solution, more or less strong, of ammonia in water. We mean the pure, anhydrous (waterless) or dry ammonia gas, which has been condensed to a liquid by pressure and cooling. The difference between this liquid and water, for the end here in view, may be seen from this, that water boils, *i.e.*, passes into the gaseous state, at 212° F. in the open air; whereas this liquid, or liquified ammonia, boils at 38° *below* zero, or 250° below the boiling point of water. No out-door temperature ever experienced on the eastern coast of the United States, would be low enough to keep this liquid from boiling away. This is just the kind of stuff we wanted. Besides, in evaporating, it absorbs a very large quantity of heat, which is another good point; and lastly, it can readily be condensed back to the liquid state again, and this is its third trump card.

The ice plant is set up substantially as follows: First, there is the refrigerator in which the freezing is to take place. It is a long rectangular, iron tank, in which the moulds containing the water to be frozen are hung. The refrigerator itself is filled with strong brine, which may be cooled far below the freezing point of water without being itself congealed. In the bottom of the refrigerator are coils of iron pipe, which are connected at one end with the supply of ammonia, and and at the other with the suction pipe of a powerful steam pump. Next, we have the steam engine to run that pump. The delivery pipe of the pump is connected with other coils of pipe constituting the condenser. The coils of the condenser are enclosed in a tank, through which water, as cold as is obtainable, is kept constantly flowing. From these con-

densing coils a pipe leads back to the ammonia tank, and so the cycle is complete. Now let us see how the machine works.

A valve is opened, and the liquid ammonia rushes into the refrigerator coils, evaporating as it goes, and this evaporation is further aided by the pump which now starts up. The evaporation cools the ammonia, the ammonia cools the coils, the coils cool the brine (considerably below the freezing point of water), the brine cools the moulds hanging in it, the moulds cool the water they contain ; and that water soon begins to freeze. The moulds are moved slowly along in the brine, and when the contents of the first one is solidly frozen, it is hooked out, dipped in warm water to detach the block of ice, which is then cast forth *à la Jonah ;* then the mould travels back to be filled again, and takes its place in the rear of the icy procession which keeps up its solemn tramp, day and night, through a sort of artificial glacial period.

We must not forget our ammonia. Having done its work, we might imagine it would be let off on a holiday. By no means, for, if corporations have no souls, machines have no consciences, nor machine-men either, for that matter. The ammonia enters the pumps in the gaseous state ; the pump drives it on, under continually increasing pressure, and by the aid of the cooling-water, condenses it to a liquid again, in which state it flows back to the supply tank, and so it is used over and over again. After all, the real work is done by the steam engine and the cold water ; the ammonia only serves as a go-between to carry the heat away from the brine to the cooling tank where it gives it up, and then goes round the back way seeking for more.

Machines of this kind have been constructed, capable, it is said, of producing 150 tons of ice every 24 hours ; and, exclusive of the care of the steam boiler, one man at a time is enough to run the whole concern.

If the water used has not been deprived of its dissolved air in freezing, it will imprison some of this air in the shape of bubbles, and the ice will not be perfectly transparent. There is no harm in this, except that such ice wastes away more rapidly in use. This defect is remedied by stirring the water continually during the process of freezing, or better by using only distilled water from which the air has been carefully excluded. A block of ice made by this process is a joy to look on and an ornament to any home.

The question now arises as to how this artificial ice compares with nature's product. As regards cost, that depends on circumstances. If we are allowed to choose our own battle-ground, we have no fear of the result. We would not, for example, set up an ice plant in Alaska, nor in Labrador, nor indeed in any part of the world " where there are nine months of winter, and where all the rest of the year is very cold." We would choose a more temperate region, where however we could be sure of a good supply of moderately cool water, the year round. Give us the climate of our Southern States, or something even hotter, and we will come out ahead. There is no doubt but that ice can be manufactured in New Orleans cheaper than it can be carried there. Under

fairly favorable circumstances, it is said that it could be produced at from 75 cents to $1.25 a ton.

There is however, still another aspect to this question, and it is this. When you manufacture ice from day to day, according as it is needed, you are not obliged to keep it in stock, and lose half of it by melting before it is put to use; and what is more important still, what is in fact the most important thing, is that you need not make it of dirty or doubtful water. In those places where natural ice is plentiful and cheap, it may be used for all mere external refrigerating purposes; but when there is question of our internal economy, give us the pure, manufactured article, or give us—none at all.

T. J. A. Freeman, S. J.

Book Notices.

DIE GROSSEN WELTRÆTHSEL. PHILOSOPHIE D. NATUR. Von *Tilmann Pesch, S. J.* Zweite, Verbessete. Auflage Erster Band, Philos. Naturerklärung. Pp. xxv., 799. 8vo. Zweiter Band. Naturphilosoph. Weltauffassung. Pp. xii., 616. Herder: St. Louis. 1892.

One of the points strongly urged on Catholic philosophers by Leo XIII., in his memorable encyclical, "Æterni Patris," was, that they should make a thorough study of the physical sciences, and bring to bear on a radical explanation of what these sciences have thus far discovered, the principles and certain deductions of the scholastic metaphysics. In consequence of the papal utterance, there has been a marked improvement during the last decade in the character of our literature dealing with questions of natural philosophy. Of the monographs that have appeared, Father Pesch's large work, "Institutiones Philosophiæ Naturalis"—an integral part of the "Cursus Lacensis," publishing by the Jesuit professors formerly of Maria-Laach—merited the first place in point of merit until the appearance, three years later, of the first edition of the same author's more comprehensive work, the second edition of which is now before us.

The title of these volumes is purely conventional. The fundamental questions regarding the nature, origin, destiny, of itself and its environment, which the human intellect is instinctively urged to put—and the answers to which sound philosophy, starting from the basis of common sense, satisfactorily presents—have become, in the minds of many latter-day thinkers, "*enigmas*," "*riddles*," and so are called. Though, in fact, there are no such *enigmas*, but only *problems*, suggested by consciousness, yet in deference to usage, Father Pesch retains the term. He employs it, however, not to designate all, even of the more radical, *enigmata* or *problems* of nature, but to cover hardly more than those which constitute the subject-matter of *Natural Philosophy*, in the technical acceptation of this branch of knowledge.

A difficulty to the building of a *philosophy* of nature lies in the way. Is such a philosophy, or, in other words, is a metaphysic of the physical sciences possible? Empiricism, Positivism, says, No. Our author opens his work with a vigorous onslaught on this popular movement in modern thought. Working pretty much on the lines he had adopted in his "Institutiones," referred to above, he carefully maps off the boundaries between natural *science*, pure and simple, and natural *philosophy*, and shows how the human mind, by its natural constitution as revealed in the data of consciousness, cannot be satisfied with the explanation of cosmic phenomena proposed by physical *science*, but must press onward and upward to the higher reasons set forth by *philosophy*. Empiricism contradicts itself by denying the metaphysical order, and at the same time accepting, as it everywhere does in physical *science*, the principle of causality, and the validity of sense-perception, both of which truths have no meaning if there be no really objective sphere of metaphysical truth.

Father Pesch next takes a defensive position for the peripatetic philosophy of nature. He shows that the Aristotelian philosophy as perfected by the early and later scholastics was by no means a purely *a*

priori system. This is sufficiently evident from its fundamental teaching that all knowledge begins with the senses, though as our author admits, "experimental study of nature was in *fact* and not in *principle* too much neglected by mediæval philosophers." He points to the primary concepts of the old philosophy, to its true dualism in the constitution of matter, of living beings, especially of man, of the world, and shows how these form a basis for a solid philosophy of nature. Far-seeing scientists are feeling to-day more than ever before the need of a root science which shall co-ordinate and present an ultimate harmonious explanation of the data of the various physical sciences. The cry is "back to the old philosophy." But where is the "old philosophy?" Surely not amongst the myriad theories that have sprung up and crumbled to ruins since the day when Descartes first put his hand at system building. Nor yet in the schools of Greece alone; but in that structure "which based on the developed culture of pre-Christian antiquity, was, until the begining of the last century, the shelter of the profoundest thinkers in the Christian church, the profoundest thinkers therefore of three-fourths of Europe—a structure which starting from *experience* and, reared in closely jointed parts, rises into the sphere of the supersensible, a proof that the human mind builds beyond the plain where eye and hand and fancy work" (p. 108).

Father Pesch goes on to sketch the history and development of natural philosophy from its beginning with the Ionics to the completion of the Aristotelian system by the scholastics—a completion, however, which he insists is but relative to the time and circumstances of the builders. The peripatetic philosophy of nature needs considerable pruning, whilst its principles must be much more fully developed and applied. It must enter more critically into the study of facts and give up its too great adherence to the "words of the master." And yet whilst admitting that in explaining the mechanico-material side of nature we must advance considerably beyond the science of the olden times, he claims, nevertheless, to show in the main body of his work "that the needed corrections lie only on the surface, that the deeper philosophic conception of nature remains quite intact; to show, moreover, that it is the philosophy of the ancients and it alone which is in a position to solve the 'enigmas' which physical research proposes" (p. 141).

He then proceeds to classify and describe the root concepts of natural science: matter, its properties, states, movements; energy, its unity and conservation; law, finality, etc.

The various philosophic theories—the mechanical, dynamic, chemico-atomic—that have been devised to furnish an ultimate explanation of these concepts are examined, their inadequacy demonstrated; a comprehensive study of the peripatetic system as to the essential constitution of bodies, their properties, and relations in space and time; as to the constitution of living things; the nature of man in his lower and higher life; as to the origin and final cause of universal nature, is set forth *in extenso*.

"Two fundamental conceptions of the universe stand to-day in conflict or rather have always been in strife for the mastery over man's life. On the one side the Theistic-Christian, which, so far as the might of human thought extends—raises itself on the basis of the Platonic peripatetic philosophy. On the other side, conscious or unconscious Atheism. . . . . Monism is the tower of Babel set up by atheistic speculation. . . . . In one or another form Socialism and Liberalism build upon it" (vol. ii., p. 2). Monism banishes from science and philosophy all dualism as to body and soul, the world and God. One entity, it is

claimed, lies at the bottom and pervades all that is or at least all that appears to be.

The greater part of the second volume is taken up with a refutation of the various Monistic theories. Probably its most telling, as it certainly is the most interesting section of this part of the work is that dealing with mechanical Monism—the theory which resolves the totality of being into atoms and motion. Our author examines this theory as regards the origin of the elements and their movement, the origin of man, the descent and transmutation of organic species. The Darwinian hypothesis is especially dwelt on. The arguments for and against the various theories of evolution are thoroughly and fairly stated, but the outcome is decidedly to the detriment of those theories inasmuch especially as they bear upon man's higher and moral life.

The work closes with an excellent treatise on the dualistic position of Christian philosophy, showing that Theism alone can give a logical account of the world, its origin, order, development, conservation and finality, particularly in view of the rational principle in human nature. Especially satisfactory is the last chapter on man in his relation to God, wherein the inability of the leading modern theories to account for or to furnish a philosophic basis for religion is proven, and the true nature and source of religion admirably set forth.

What we have said will suffice to show the general character of this important work. The subjects it treats are too large to permit our going here into anything like detail. For the rest, we find in these volumes that same comprehensive grasp of his subject, that familiarity with the entire range of pertinent literature, ancient and modern, that wonderful analytical power, that facility of exposition which have made Father Pesch's "Philosophia Naturalis," and his "Institutiones Logicales," such valuable aids both to professor and to student, while the general reader seeking to widen his philosophical culture is presented with as facile an instrument as the nature of the subject-matter will allow; for the author has succeeded in brightening the obscurer ways of thought by the charms of rhetoric.

The improvements brought into the present edition are not of an essential character. The more recent scientific literature has been collated, some abbreviations and expansions made, but on the whole the work is substantially the same as it appeared in the first edition.

SOCIALE FRAGE UND SOCIALE ORDNUNG; ODER INSTITUTIONEN DER GESELLSCHAFTSLEHRE. Von *Fr. Albert Maria Weiss, O. Pr.* Erster u. Zweiter Theil. Freiburg im Br. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1892.

The so-called "Social Question" has different aspects, each of which constitutes a more or less predominant element, according to the ideals of the various parties who seek its satisfactory solution. In the popular mind it is associated, if not identified, with the "labor question," and it must be allowed that the growing opposition of labor against capital has brought on a crisis and practically constitutes the difficulty with which modern legislators have to deal.

But the social question is not a purely economical problem which arbitration on lines of equity and common justice could settle. It has its moral phases also, and these go to its very root and origin. The general discontent of the laboring classes is not so much a revolt against oppression as rather the conscious awakening of some new power in their possession of which they were hitherto ignorant. The animal which before this freely gave its milk to those who knew how to utilize

it to further purpose has found a way to refuse the nourishing commodity except it have free access into the clover-patch. As a result, the cow ails from the unrelieved pressure on its udder, and the master, in addition to the loss of the milk, is in danger of being struck by the irritated animal. The veterinaries are called in. They disagree. One advises to let her into the clover-field. The owner objects because there is not enough to last all the year round, and says that this process would, after spoiling the animal's appetite, end in starving both master and cow. A second says: The milk belongs to the cow, therefore he who wants it must purchase it on her own terms. A third insists that the cow and the master, both being animals, are equal, and if the latter cannot hold his own against the cow's superior strength he must yield to the inevitable law of "survival of the fittest."

In such fashion do the popular charlatans of social reform outargue each other on the basis of truisms half or wholly ill applied.

There are, indeed, men of more earnest thought and endeavor who recognize that the remedy of the existing economical evils must be applied to the inner organism in the first place, and that the general discontent which manifests itself in different classes of society is mainly the outcome of illusory views and aspirations produced by a magnifying mirror, which in reality hides what lies beyond it and what constitutes man's legitimate aim.

In France, where "Socialism" has reached an extreme of anarchism, Le Play was one of the first in our day to raise a strong bulwark against the radical notions of compulsory division of property by the state, which largely affected the populace of the industrial districts. He founded a new school of social policy, the *Union de la paix sociale*, which, by means of agitation and through its organ, the *Réforme sociale*, has made numerous converts in influential political circles in France and elsewhere. Le Play believes that the evils which afflict society at present are mainly due to the disorganization of family life, and he seeks accordingly the remedy in a reform of the family. The basis of this reform is to be laid in the restrictions of the Decalogue as appealing to the conscience of all right-minded men. However good this plan in the abstract may seem, it is insufficient to cope with the real issues of socialism. The present laxity of the family ties and the lowered moral standard of domestic obligations have their origin, if rightly considered, in the prevailing social doctrines of our day; they are not the result, but the cause—or, at least, the accompaniment—of the general deviation from the higher moral standard. It is true that the reform of society must begin in the family as an integral part of the civil community, but it is still more true that it must begin by an appeal to stronger and loftier motives than those held out by the natural law as formulated in the Decalogue. If it must be admitted on all sides that the Christian religion is an improvement on the Mosaic law, and that European civilization in its highest forms is a result of the doctrine and maxims of our Lord, then it is obvious that a complete remedy of the ills of which society complains is to be sought in the application of Christian principles.

Such is the reasoning to which P. Weiss applies himself, and his test is as infallible as the doctrine upon which he bases it. He arrays before us the palpable facts which make up the present situation—public life under the influence of modern ideas and ideals. State-absolutism, the right of Revolution, Liberalism as the enemy of the supernatural, and Socialism in all its forms are examined in their various manifestations. Next the nature and attributes of Right in the physical, moral, social

and supernatural order are defined and compared. The third part of the work deals with the elements of the social fabric, the individual and its relation to property and labor. In the fourth place we have the family in its origin and resultant responsibility.

The second volume comprises the treatment of the "social problem" proper. The author sketches the difficulties and the remedies offered from different quarters, showing the insufficiency of each in turn. He then points out in detail the means which Christianity, and the Catholic Church in particular, has at hand for the readjustment of the existing troublesome elements.

It is not within our scope as reviewer to repeat in substance the principal arguments of the author. Suffice it to say that he treats the subject with a master-hand and upon lines not marked by the leading of doubtful human knowledge, but in the light of revealed and *à priori* certain truths.

The two volumes before us, though complete in themselves, are part of a series in five volumes, entitled "Apology of the Christian Religion Viewed from the Point of Moral Culture."

The work has been well received by European scholars, and we commend it to all those who are interested in the study of social and political economy.

Most Reverend John Hughes, First Archbishop of New York. By *Rev. Henry A. Brann, D.D.*, Rector of St. Agnes' Church. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company. 1892.

In a compact volume of somewhat less than two hundred pages Rev. Dr. Brann has presented the American public with a "popular" life of the great Archbishop of New York, who so well deserves a place among the "Makers of America." The biography of a man so intellectual, so forceful, so active as an ecclesiastic and as a citizen, deserves attention from men of every denomination and from men of no denomination. Circumstances led the priest, the bishop, the archbishop, to defend the truth, to contend for the right and to oppose error, from the platform and in the press, as well as from the pulpit. The story of his life is, in fact, a most important chapter in the history of the American people, and of the Catholic Church in the United States. To the Catholics of to-day, and also to non-Catholics, this chapter of our history should teach many valuable lessons.

The early struggles of John Hughes convey a lesson in strong purpose that may well be taken to heart by all young men. The record of the priesthood of Father Hughes, no young priest can read without benefit. As bishop, as archbishop, how many lessons his life and work taught and teach laymen and cleric! A man of faith, he was none the less a man of tact and of courage.

The prejudices that hampered the Catholics of his day, Father Hughes, Bishop Hughes, Archbishop Hughes fought persistently and successfully. He did not uproot prejudice, but he limited its growth, he discouraged the sowers of the seed, and, above all, he encouraged those who suffered from the pest. He united Catholics in an orderly and manly defence of their rights as citizens. Thus they forced respect and made the cultivation of prejudice unprofitable.

Reverend Doctor Brann is in full sympathy with the great Archbishop of New York. Every page proves this sympathy. Indeed, few who read the writer's concise, lively and forcible book can withhold admiration from his "hero." Probably the chapters in which the author

gives an account of the archbishop's action during the public school controversy in New York will excite more than common interest at this time, when the question of education is so widely discussed, and when it has, in more than one State, been made a political question. Those who would wholly divide religion from politics, comparing Rev. Dr. Brann's pages with the columns of the newspapers and periodicals of to-day will see that, in the nineties as in the forties, religion and politics may collide. The politician always looks upon religion as a convenient part of politics.

Archbishop Hughes was no politician. He was a patriot, a deep and warm lover of his adopted country, ever working for her advantage and ever ready to serve her. One of the most admirable chapters in Rev. Dr. Brann's admirable book is devoted to the subject of the archbishop's patriotic action during the Civil War, and of his effective diplomacy at the Court of Napoleon III. Reading this chapter we ask ourselves: Why have not our citizens, regardless of party, erected a memorial statue to the patriot who saved us from foreign intervention at a most critical time?

The influence of Archbishop Hughes on our literature has not received from our writers the attention it deserves. Reverend Doctor Brann has a suggestive chapter on this subject, and we hope that his criticisms and the extracts he quotes from poems and letters may lead some one to make an exhaustive study of the works of a writer who handled subjects so many and various.

Is it not worthy of remark that the publishers of this life of the Most Reverend John Hughes are not Catholics? And is not their imprint a proof that there is no lack of readers for books written by Catholics? To Catholic writers it must be gratifying to feel that they may hope for a market and a public through the commercial enterprise of non-Catholics. Congratulating Rev. Dr. Brann on the care given by the publishers to the make-up of his book, we must also congratulate him on the very readable and instructive volume that we owe to his virile pen and to his thoughtful mind.

Die Apostelgeschichte uebersetzt und erklaert. Von *Dr. Joseph Felten*, Professor der Theologie an der Universität zu Bonn. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1892. Price, $3.00.

This latest work of a writer already well known to learned Catholics by reason of important labors, chiefly in the domain of mediæval church history, takes the form of a jubilee gift to the Archbishop of Cologne on the fiftieth anniversary of the ordination to the priesthood of that eminent prelate. It is a gift worthy of the renown of the donor and of the dignity and virtues of the venerable recipient, and we have no doubt that Archbishop (now Cardinal) Krementz prized this intellectual jewel far more than offerings of gold and silver. It is a jewel which will not be jealously concealed in a treasure-chamber, but which will find its way into distant lands and, we trust, into many languages, to the glory of the author and of his superior, and, what is of infinitely greater value, to the glory of God and of His Church.

Of all the books of Holy Writ that of the *Acts of the Apostles*, or, as St. Chrysostom seems to call it, the *Acts of the Holy Ghost* (τῶν παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος εἰργασμένων), is the most appropriate for satisfying the daily needs of the clergy; for, as Archbishop Krementz beautifully remarks, "The reading of the *Acts* is perhaps, more than any other reading, able to revive in our souls that grace which was given us through the imposition of hands." What a privilege it is for the missionary priest to be

able to live in familiar intercourse with those two great exemplars of missionary activity, Sts. Peter and Paul! In this inspired book all the apostolic men of subsequent ages have found precedents to guide and sustain them, and St. Luke may be said to have laid down the model followed by every hagiographer from his age to our own. In order to convince one's self of the large influence which has been wielded by this one book in forming the habits and customs of the Christian community, one need but endeavor to eliminate from his mind his reminiscences of the *Acts*, and observe how wide is the gap which he would discover. The *Acts*, therefore, ought to occupy a very prominent place in the education of Catholic youth, especially in the Seminary, and the fact that St. Luke's style is more polished and classical than that of any other inspired writer points out his work as eminently the proper text-book to be placed in the hands of young students of Greek; in fact, a school edition of the *Acts*, with historical and geographical notes, would be a most acceptable addition to our somewhat meagre repertory of biblical text-books. We have many professors in the land quite capable of undertaking this good work, and we earnestly hope some one of them will set about it very soon. In the preparation of such an edition Dr. Felten's commentary would be of the greatest utility, for every conceivable question relating to his subject the Bonn professor has touched off with the comprehensive simplicity and vigor of a master hand. It is safe to say that he has not overlooked a single item of interest from beginning to end. He shows an acquaintance with the literature of the subject, whether patristical or modern, whether Catholic, Protestant or infidel, which is simply amazing; and what is still more admirable, in the midst of this erudition he maintains his calm appreciation of the true scope of the inspired book. A spirit of genuine Catholic piety pervades the book, and the impression left upon the reader is one of solid Christian edification. Let us have it in an English dress, and may all Catholic commentators study Felten's method of combining vast erudition with simple Catholic faith.

HIERURGIA; OR, THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. With notes and dissertations, elucidating its doctrines and ceremonies, and numerous illustrations. By *Daniel Rock, D.D.* Third edition revised by W. H James Weale. Vols. I. and II. London: John Hodges, Agar St., Charing Cross. New York: Benziger Bros.

This is a new edition of an old work. We are delighted to give it greeting, and are sure the clergy generally will hail it with pleasure. The end and aim of the author is principally to explain the ceremonies and elucidate the doctrine of the Mass. And that end he has accomplished with a fulness and a scholarship rarely met with in works of the kind. His method, too, we greatly admire. In the first part the author gives us the Ordinary of the Mass, in Latin and English. Then we have about eighty pages of most valuable notes, explanatory of the ceremonies of the ritual of the Liturgy. The second part of the work the author devotes to a plain, solid, learned exposition of the doctrine of the Eucharist as a sacrifice and a sacrament; of the Church's doctrine on the Invocation of Saints, on Purgatory, on Images and Vestments. A most excellent feature of this splendid work are the copper-plate and wood engravings executed by artists of noted ability.

Knowledge, it is said, is power. In the kingdom of God—in spiritual things, knowledge is love. Men do not love God, because they do not know Him. Now if there be one thing, of which more than all other things men ought to have clearest knowledge, it is the Mass—the great

sacrifice of the new Law. That men generally have not this clearest knowledge of the Mass, that they see it only in a dim way, and are unconscious of its wondrous beauties and consequent efficacy, is a well-known fact. How little is known of the higher, spiritual, symbolic meaning of the prayers of the Mass! And yet there is so very much in that meaning that would go far to lift up the heart to God. And so, too, with the other rites of the Church. The people come and gaze, and their wonder grows, and there it ends. They have not caught the spirit of the feast or the ceremony; they have not been impressed, and as far as they (the people) are concerned, the grand rite or ceremony has been barren of results. This is certainly a deplorable fact. And in the light of that fact we can estimate in a measure the value of such works as the "Hierurgia." The "Hierurgia" ought, in the first place, to be in every priest's library, It ought, in the second place, to form the foundation of a priest's sermons on the Mass and ceremonies. Why cannot we have more books of this kind? Above all things we need such books for the people. Some one has said that dogma is the soul of devotion. A fuller, a more intelligent understanding of the Mass and its ceremonies will infallibly lead men nearer to God. Give us more books of this kind and give them to us in popular form. The people need them, the interests of God demand them.

---

1. Die Psalmen, nach dem Urtexte uebersetzt und erklaert. Von *P. Friedrich Raffl, O.S. Fr.* III. Band. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. 1892. Price $2.35.

2. Die Psalmen der Vulgata uebersetzt und nach dem Literalsinn erklaert. Von *Gottfried Hoberg*, Professor der Universität Freiburg. L. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. 1892. Price $2.90.

3. Psallite Sapienter. "Psalliret weise!" Von *Dr. Maurus Wolter, O.S.B.* Second edition. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. 1892. Vol. iii., $2.50; vol. v., $2.25.

If the Catholics of Germany do not perfect themselves in the knowledge of the divine psalmody, it certainly will not be the fault of the great publishing house of Herder. Three different expositions of the Psalms in one year! This is equally creditable to the enterprise of the publishers and to the piety of the clergy and faithful people of Germany. The immediate aim of the three authors is different. Raffl (who, strangely enough, has begun at the end in true Hebrew fashion) is chiefly concerned with the original text, in dealing with which he displays a thorough mastery of the cognate Oriental languages; Hoberg, as his title indicates, is intent upon elucidating the Vulgate; whilst Wolter writes for the people, enabling them to enter into the spirit of the liturgy of the Church. We fear this edifying activity of our brethren in Germany cries shame upon our own apathy.

Die Lehre von den Heiligen Sacramenten der Katholischen Kirche. Von *Dr. Paul Schanz*, Professor der Theologie an der Universität Tübingen. Herder: Freiburg im Breisgau. 1893. Price $3.50.

Any one who has read Dr. Schanz's *Christian Apology* will need no introduction to the profound theologian of Catholic Tübingen; for, strange as it would sound to one who knew Tübingen a generation ago, that picturesque little university town, the whilom "home of the advanced school of theological criticism," is becoming even more identified with solid orthodox Catholic thought. Towards this transforma-

tion Schanz has contributed a powerful share; and his present great work on the Sacraments will be recognized as the crowning effort of his life. It is, indeed, a fitting sequel to his former work; for having laid the deep foundation of Catholic truth in his *Apology* against modern infidelity, he now proceeds to overthrow the basis of modern heresy which is nothing more than a denial of the sacramental character of the Christian religion. After the exhaustive controversies of the past three hundred years, the issue between Catholicity and Protestantism has narrowed itself down to the question of the nature and efficacy of the Sacraments. To admit the sacramental doctrine of the Catholic Church is equivalent to admitting the whole body of her teaching. Naturally enough; for Lutheranism and its off-shoots were, radically, erroneous conceptions respecting the Holy Sacraments. The author, following the traditional and rational manner of treating his subject, discourses during the first two hundred pages on the general nature, the institution, the efficacy and number of the Christian sacraments, and in the remaining five hundred and fifty pages deals with the seven sacraments in particular, extracting throughout from the well filled treasury of his soul *nova et vetera*. A fuller review will be given of this grand work when it is translated into English, as we pray it soon may be.

Jesus The All Beautiful. A devotional treatise on the character and actions of our Lord. By the author of "The Voice of the Sacred Heart," and "The Heart of Jesus of Nazareth." Edited by the Rev. J. B. Macleod, S. J. London: Burns & Oates, Limited. 1892.

This is a well-written book. It is clearly thought out and in style far above the ordinary. It is, however, a book for the educated. In conception and tone of treatment, it is clearly above the grasp of the people. It is not what we call a popular treatise. Whether such character in a devotional work can be looked upon as an imperfection offers much ground for debate. Some there are who think that way; and many indeed who think as evidently the author thinks. Of the chapters of the book, we like best those which treat of the authority and gentleness of our Lord. They are quite suggestive and worthy of thoughtful study. We wish this work all success.

Encyclopaedie und Methodologie der Theologie. Von *Dr. Heinrich Kihn*, Professor der Theologie an der Königl. Universität Würzburg. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1892. Price, $3.

The aim of the author of this latest addition to the works making up Herder's Theological Library is to take a general survey of the entire field of theology and to show the logical connection between its different parts. It is a work of vast erudition, and betrays such an intimate acquaintance with every department of theological science that the learned author would seem to be thoroughly at home, and, indeed, a specialist in each particular branch. We can easily believe his assertion that the book represents many years of severe study. But it is worth all the labor he has bestowed on it.

A Brief Text-Book of Logic and Mental Philosophy. By *Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J.* New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. 1892.

The aim of this little volume, in the modest words of the author, is simply "to present to pupils unfamiliar with Latin a brief outline of a

sound philosophy conformable to the teachings of the schoolmen." It is chiefly meant for "class use in academies and similar institutions"; and we will add, for use in our Catholic reading circles, to which we take great pleasure in heartily recommending it. We conceive that, in the hands of a good director, it would soon make logic and mental philosophy extremely popular with our young men and women.

THE CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS. By the *Rev. Daniel O. Loan*, Dean, Maynooth College. Dublin: Browne & Nolan. New York: Benzinger Brothers.

This book has no preface, and we do not know why it was published. It is a good book in the sense that it treats of good things, and treats of them well. It is also well printed on good paper and it makes an attractive volume. But why should we have a ceremonial on *some* ecclesiastical functions and why particularly on *those* ecclesiastical functions? Have we not already many excellent ceremonials that treat well not only on *those* ecclesiastical functions, but on *all* others that concern a priest in his ordinary labors? It is certainly most desirable, especially for busy men, to concentrate information as much as possible, and therefore we do not see the advisibility of publishing a partial ceremonial. This does not detract at all from the excellence of the book in itself; the reputation of the learned author is a sufficient guarantee of that; but we do not like its limitations.

THEOLOGIA PASTORALIS COMPLECTUS PRACTICAM INSTITUTIONEM CONFESSARII. *Auctore Jos. Aertnys, C.SS.R.* Theologiæ Moralis et S. Liturgiæ Professore. Tornaci: H. et L. Casterman. 1892. Received from Burns & Oates.

This little book is intended by its learned author to be the sequel to his larger work on Moral Theology. It is replete with practical instructions guiding the young confessor in the exercise of his god-like mission. The author draws his maxims from the most approved authors and from his own varied and intimate knowledge of human nature. We know of no other book of equal dimensions so well fitted to put an old head upon young shoulders, which is the English of *young presbyter*.

ANALYSIS OF THE GOSPELS OF THE SUNDAYS OF THE YEAR. From the Italian of Angelo Cagnola. By *Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL.D.*, author of "Notes on Ingersoll," "Tactics of Infidels." New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1892.

We like this book; it is just what the busy overworked priest desires. In three or four, or five, or six questions and answers it gives him a splendid digest of the gospel for each Sunday. It is most suggestive and quite practical.

We gladly recommend it to our clergy. They will find it a most valuable assistance in extempore preaching.

THE MARRIAGE PROCESS IN THE UNITED STATES By *Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D.* New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1893.

The officials of the new "Matrimonial Courts" throughout the country will peruse this latest work of Dr. Smith with great avidity. Not having had time to read it, we content ourselves for the present with thanking the learned author for his last and most opportune gift to the American clergy.

ATLAS HISTORIQUE ET GEOGRAPHIQUE DE LA BIBLE. Par le *Dr. Richard de Riess.* Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, $1.75.

Ten colored charts, executed with the beauty and accuracy for which Germany is renowned, narrate to the eye the history of God's people from Genesis to the Apocalypse. When we remember the maps we used when studying Sacred History, we cannot refrain from envying the happier lot of the youth of the present generation.

DIE BERGPREDIGT CHRISTI IN IHREM ORGANISCHEN ZUSAMMENHANGE ERKLAERT. Von *Dr. Hugo Weiss*, Ord. Professor der Theologie am Königl. Lyceum Hosianum zu Braunsberg: Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1892. Price, 75 cts.

A concise and learned commentary upon the Sermon on the Mount, dedicated to the younger clergy, to whom it will serve as an excellent model of popular exegesis.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

ENCHIRIDION AD SACRARUM DISCIPLINARUM CULTORES ACCOMMODATUM. OPERA ET STUDIO ZEPHYRINI ZITELLI-NATALI. Editio quarta emendatior, cura *A. J. Maas, S.J.* Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1892.

DIE HAUPTPROBLEME SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT IN IHREN BEZIEHUNGEN ZUR THEOLOGIE, PHILOSOPHIE UND ANTHROPOLOGIE. Von *Dr. Alexander Giesswein.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1892. Price, $2.

JOHN LOCKE UND DIE SCHULE VON CAMBRIDGE. Von *Dr. Georg Freihernn von Hertling.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1892. Price, $2.

From Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago:

THE CREED EXPLAINED; or, An Exposition of Catholic Doctrine, according to the Creeds of Faith and the Constitutions and Definitions of the Church. By the *Rev. Arthur Devine*, Passionist.

WORDS OF WISDOM FROM THE SCRIPTURES. A Concordance of the Sapiental Books. Prepared from the French (Migne's Collection). Edited by John J. Bell. With a preface by Very Rev. A. Magnien, S.S., D.D.

A GENTLEMAN. By *Maurice Francis Egan, LL.D.*

From Burns & Oates, London; and Benziger Brothers:

A COURSE OF LENTEN SERMONS ON THE SACRED PASSION AND DEATH OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. By the *Rev. P. Sabela.* Second Edition.

From Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati:

SHORT SERMONS AND EPISTLES FOR EVERY SUNDAY IN THE YEAR. By the *Very Rev. N. M. Redmond, V. F.*

From Cashman, Keating & Co., Boston:

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF FAITH AND MORALS, Gathered from Sacred Scriptures, Decrees of Councils, and Approved Catechisms. By *Very Rev. William Byrne, D.D., V. G.*

From P. O'Shea, Publisher, New York:

THE LIFE AND VOYAGES OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS. With an Introductory Preface by one of the Dominican Fathers.

From John Hodges, London:

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS: His Life, Labors and Discoveries. By *Mariana Monteiro.*